

## TOPICS OF THE TIME.

### "The Century's" Twentieth Anniversary.

THE first number of this magazine (under another name) bears the date of November, 1870. If this were not an unescapable fact it would be hard for those of us who have worked in the editing and publishing of it from the beginning to realize that twenty years have elapsed since, with how much of strain and anxiety, of enthusiasm and honest pride, the initial number was at last made up, printed, bound, and issued to the world!

It has seemed to us as perhaps more modest, as well as more feasible, not to attempt at this time a detailed review of the literary and art accomplishments of THE CENTURY, but instead to dwell upon the mechanical phase of magazine development in our day; and to this end we have asked Mr. Theodore L. De Vinne to describe the evolution which has taken place in his own printing house in connection with periodical printing. Mr. De Vinne was not the first printer of the magazine; but early in its history he took hold of it, and the progress made during the lifetime of THE CENTURY has been owing very largely to his own skill, energy, and patience in experiment. In the interesting article he has written, and which is published in this number, nothing is said of this; but it would ill become us not to make here and now such public acknowledgment. With a printer less conscientious, less open to new ideas, it would have been easy to block or delay the advance in magazine illustration which has been urged forward by the Art Department of The Century Co. and the artists and artist-engravers who have so ably worked for this magazine and for its companion ST. NICHOLAS. It is gratifying to be assured that the above statement will not be set down as a strained form of self-glorification, but that, on the contrary, it only expresses the opinion of nearly all, either at home or abroad, who have watched the development of modern illustrated periodicals.

It would be an agreeable task to speak here by name of the various members of THE CENTURY force, in all the various departments, who have worked with devotion to a single end, during a large part, or the whole, of the past twenty years. But omitting this we may, and should surely, speak of one who is no longer with us. Dr. Holland, besides being one of the founders, was editor-in-chief of the magazine during eleven years of its existence. The aims and methods and general character which he gave it are strongly impressed upon THE CENTURY; while, in sympathy with the times, it has continued, and doubtless will continue, to expand in new and important directions.

If some other writer were reviewing the twenty years of this magazine we would wish him to examine the record of these pages as to printing and wood-engraving; to note the relation of THE CENTURY to American literature, painting, sculpture, architecture, landscape gardening, science, and invention, and to the various reforms that have been made or are in progress

in religious teaching, in education in general, in charitable enterprise, in the industrial world, and in governmental administration.

If there is any one dominant sentiment which an unprejudiced reviewer would recognize as pervading these forty half-yearly volumes it is, we think, a sane and earnest Americanism. Along with and part of the American spirit has been the constant endeavor to do all that such a publication might do to increase the sentiment of union throughout our diverse sisterhood of States—the sentiment of American nationality. It has always been the aim of THE CENTURY not only to be a force in literature and art, but to take a wholesome part in the discussion of great questions; not only to promote good literature and good art, but good citizenship.

The kind of Americanism which THE CENTURY has desired to cultivate is as far as possible from the "anti-abroad" cant of the political, literary, or artistic demagogue. It is the Americanism that deems the best of the Old World none too good for the New; that would, therefore, learn eagerly every lesson in good government, or in matters social or esthetic, that may be learned from the older countries; that would abolish entirely the stupid and brutal tax on foreign art, but is not so besotted in Anglomania as to wish, as do some American congressmen, to steal bodily the entire current literature of Great Britain for the benefit of American readers.

In working on the lines above briefly mentioned THE CENTURY has had the encouragement of a following of readers remarkable as to numbers—we believe in the same field unprecedented; remarkable also for generous appreciation. Mistakes have been no doubt made, some of them the result of that very spirit of experiment and desire for improvement which must characterize every live periodical—that spirit and that desire which if once lost would soon lose to us the immense and inspiring audience which it is THE CENTURY'S privilege and responsibility to address month by month and year by year.

### Forestry in America.

WHAT is the present stage of development and discussion of forestry interests and subjects in this country? We have not, as yet, any real forestry in America; and we can have, therefore, only talk and writing about it, consideration and discussion, or, at best, efforts to arrange and prepare means and conditions for practical forestry. Some of the States have forestry commissions, and all should have, each with one paid officer to devote his time to the promotion of popular intelligence regarding the care of wooded lands and of the sources of streams, tree-planting, and the relation of forests to the fertility of the soil and to the agricultural prosperity of the country. We have also several State forestry associations, voluntary, unofficial organizations of public-spirited men and women who

wish to stimulate popular attention and interest regarding forestry matters. Their work is useful, but it might be made much more effective. Meetings, addresses, and newspaper writing are indispensable in the earlier stages of any movement requiring popular intelligence and coöperation, but systematic and continuous effort soon becomes necessary, and this can be commanded only by employing and paying a competent agent or secretary. Many good things have had their origin in gratuitous missionary labor, but the time comes when the work of carrying them forward must be paid for.

Effort in behalf of forestry interests takes different directions in different parts of the country. The State of New York has nearly a million acres of mountain forest lands, not in one compact body, but in scattered tracts separated by private holdings. In this situation the property of the State cannot be adequately protected from spoliation, nor properly administered as a source of revenue. Those who have given attention to the matter in this State therefore favor disposing of outlying tracts, by sale or exchange, and the acquisition by the State of sufficient additional territory to constitute a large State park, or forest reservation, around the sources of the Hudson River and the other great water-ways of the State. This plan was presented in a message from the governor to the Senate during the last session of the legislature, and by the concurrent action of both branches of that body was committed to the present Forest Commission for thorough investigation, the finding to be reported to the legislature at its next meeting. This is one of the most important forestry enterprises ever undertaken in this country. The business and commercial prosperity of the city of New York depends in very large measure upon the permanent maintenance of forest conditions around the sources of the Hudson River, and the interests of large portions of the interior of the State are also closely connected with the destiny of the North Woods. No part of the Adirondack Mountain forest region is adapted to cultivation. It is naturally suited to the perpetual production of timber, and to this crop alone. The five or six millions of people who will soon be dwellers in the great city which is so rapidly growing up on and around Manhattan Island will need the whole Adirondack wilderness for an outlying park and forest playground for their summer rest and recreation. The movement to preserve these mountain forests, and to make the region a public possession, should have the cordial support of all civilized anglers and huntsmen, of lumbermen and owners of timber lands, and of public-spirited citizens in general. At present large portions of the region are being rapidly and irretrievably ruined.

There is a recent movement in Massachusetts to secure the incorporation of a board of trustees empowered to hold any parcels of ground which may be conveyed to them on account of historic interest or beauty of scenery, and to open them as parks or commons for public use, under suitable regulations and on condition of police protection. This beginning is of great importance. All the pleasant and convenient portions of the coast of New England will soon be crowded with buildings. There will be an almost continuous town, with few places left where men can walk and meditate by the sea without being intruders upon

private grounds. Land should be secured while it is obtainable for seashore commons, parks, and open spaces, with wise foresight of the conditions which will soon result from the increasing density of our population. Unless there is prompt action in this direction our children will probably live to see the shore lands everywhere inclosed, and in many places a fee demanded for a good view of the ocean, as we had to pay to see Niagara until the State of New York made that scene of beauty and grandeur a public possession and forever free to all.

It is desirable that all such efforts as this one just organized in Massachusetts should be made broad enough to include all the various public out-of-door interests which require the attention of the people, the care of beautiful scenery, of forests, streams, and wooded lands, historic sites, fish and game preserves, the purity of the water supply for towns, the treatment of roadsides, of parks, open spaces, and public grounds of all kinds. Such movements are apt to fail of full development and efficiency unless the coöperation of all classes of out-of-door people is secured. Plans for similar objects are under consideration in New Hampshire, and we hope they may be carried into effect in the preservation of the wonderful natural beauty of the White Mountain region. The scenery of New Hampshire is one of the most valuable pecuniary possessions of the people of the State. Good work has been done in Ohio and in other States in securing the preservation of important historic sites or of tracts of unusual natural beauty. California has been especially fortunate in this respect. One of her citizens, Col. J. B. Armstrong, has offered her a gift of six hundred acres of fine redwood forest to be set apart for the public use. Congress has passed the bill reserving for the public use the Tulare Big Trees, and there is every expectation that the bill for the establishment of the Yosemite National Park will also be passed. The endeavor to rescue the present Yosemite reservation from impending injury should attract and inspire all lovers of natural beauty and of the peace and joy which it nourishes, and should appeal especially to the pride and enlist the active coöperation of Californians. There is room and need for much more effort for similar objects. The people who are interested in forestry are acting wisely in organizing and carrying forward such movements. In many of the States of our country there is no opportunity for forestry in the proper sense of the term, but there is everywhere imperative need of popular education in the care of woodlands, trees, roadsides, and open spaces, and in appreciation of the value of change of scene and environment for all who live and work under the conditions of our modern life.

Our natural interest in forestry is connected chiefly with the problems of the management and destiny of the forests on the public domain. These forests, and the lands on which they stand, belong equally to the people of the whole country. They are as much the property of the inhabitants of New York and Virginia as of the people of the States in which the nation's forests and lands are situated. They should be at once withdrawn from sale, and the army of the United States should guard them from spoliation until a commission of competent men examines them and decides what portions of them should be kept permanently in forest for the protection of the sources of important

rivers. At present these invaluable forests are pillaged and devastated without scruple or limit by people who think it fine business to appropriate to themselves without cost the property of the nation. They have been doing this so long that they appear to claim the right to continue their ravages permanently, and are indignant at the suggestion of any interference by the owners of the property. Extensive tracts of these forests are destroyed by the pasturage of sheep owned by men who have no right whatever on the nation's land. Other great areas are desolated by fires, many of which are purposely started. Now these are the plain facts regarding mountain forests and their functions which are known to all persons of intelligence who have given any serious attention to forestry subjects. The sponge-like mass of roots, soil, leaves, and other vegetable matter which forms the forest floor acts as a natural storage reservoir, and holds back the water of rainfall and melting snow, allowing it to escape and descend but slowly to the channels of the streams, which are thus fed with comparatively equable flow all the year around. If forest conditions are destroyed, if the network of living root-fibers which holds the soil together and in place on steep slopes and around the shoulders of the hills is killed out by fire or pasturage, the soil soon begins to break and slip down from the hillsides, carrying away the sponge-like stratum which before had held vast quantities of water in store in a natural reservoir spread all over the surface of the hills. After this the water rushes down the hillsides in destructive torrents; and it soon scoops out great chasms and gullies, choking the streams and covering the fertile lands of the valleys below with inert sand and gravel.

The forests on the public domain have a special interest and value for the people of this country because they guard the sources of rivers which can be used to redeem and fertilize millions of acres of arid lands. A territory large enough for a great empire can be made marvelously productive by means of irrigation, if these forests on the nation's land are protected and preserved. If forest conditions are destroyed on these mountains, many millions of acres in the arid regions below must forever remain desert and uninhabitable. The timber of these forests can be fully utilized without impairing forest conditions, or affecting in any degree the permanent flow of the streams which have their sources in them. Artificial storage reservoirs will doubtless be found necessary for purposes of irrigation, to supplement the function of the natural reservoirs, the mountain forests, but if the forests are destroyed the reservoirs will be filled up with sand and gravel, dams will be broken and swept away, and there will soon be but little water available for use in agriculture. Besides, if the forest covering of the mountains is destroyed, the mountains themselves will soon begin to change. They depend upon the forests for their permanence. If they are deprived of their indispensable vital integument, "the everlasting hills" are torn away and dragged down by rushing torrents of water and storms of wind. The rivers perish because their sources are destroyed. As much water may fall as before, but it becomes destructive instead of vivifying. It rushes away in uncontrollable fury and is lost.

All this is known. It is not a matter of theory, probability, or opinion. It has been incontrovertibly

established by repeated observations in all the mountain countries of the Old World and in our own country. The results are uniform. No exceptions have been observed, and there is no question or doubt regarding these destructive tendencies and effects among those who have observed the facts which are everywhere palpable in this department of nature and of human experience. Those who know anything of the subject are agreed that, in general, the forest-clothing of mountains cannot be permanently removed without far-reaching evil results. But the interests which are opposed to the protection of the nation's forests, and which are nourished by their constant and enormous spoliation, are strong and determined.

#### A Duty of Congress to Itself.

THE defeat of the International Copyright Bill on the 2d of May has illustrated the saying that next to a victory the best thing for a good cause is a defeat. The movement for honorable treatment of literary property has shown its vitality since that vote as never before; has, in fact,

Spring harmless up, refreshed by blows.

The indignant protest with which the unexpected rejection of this measure was greeted by the press and by the opinion of educated people in general cannot be mistaken: it clearly demonstrates that whatever stigma the House of Representatives may be willing to put upon itself, the people of the United States do not deserve to rest under the charge of being "a nation of pirates." Never was public sentiment more outraged or more ill-divined than by those Representatives who concluded that their popularity was to be enhanced by voting for what they erroneously supposed to be "cheap books." There has never been presented the slightest evidence that any considerable portion of our people oppose this reform, while the Copyright Committee has poured in upon Congress petitions for its passage from hundreds of the most distinguished Americans in all walks of life. The luster of these names should have challenged the attention of Representatives and plead for the importance of the measure. As it is, the House has put itself in a most disgraceful position — disgraceful to the country, but chiefly to itself. Happily there is yet an opportunity in the present Congress for righting the record. Should the present long session terminate without the redress of this time-honored wrong, let it be a solemn obligation upon every reader of these lines to urge upon his Representative during the recess his duty to the cause of justice, to the opinion of intelligent sentiment everywhere, and to the collective and individual reputation of members of Congress.

To Representatives who do not recognize an ethical obligation to set the official seal of criminality upon an offense which has incurred the condemnation of the civilized world, appeal may be made — indeed has unceasingly been made — in the name of the prosperity of American literature. It is humiliating to have to urge upon lawmakers so elementary a consideration as the value of a national literature — that literature is the phonograph of national life, preserving and reproducing what is most worth record; that it is a standing

army for the defense of national ideas and institutions; a necessary means of fireside travel and of intellectual interchange by which the sympathies of the different sections of the country are strengthened; and, last of all, the strongest barrier to a sordid materialism which is the greatest menace to the American system of government. Alas! to reach some legislators even these considerations seem too subtle; they are not cast in the idiom of the corridors of the Capitol. Some material equation of dollars and cents seems to be needed, such as the fact that American authors have suffered the loss of millions of money by the absence of International Copyright. To such Representatives that statement seems more tangible than, for instance, this significant paragraph from Sir Henry Maine's treatise on "Popular Government":

The power to grant patents by federal authority has, however, made the American people the first in the world for the number and ingenuity of the inventions by which it has promoted the "useful arts"; while, on the other hand, the neglect to exercise this power for the advantage of foreign writers has condemned the whole American community to a literary servitude unparalleled in the history of thought.

These words, nevertheless, are painfully true, and until writers are admitted to the equality of the law with other men we probably shall never have in America a thoroughly self-sustaining profession of letters, producing a national literature of three dimensions—with depth of thought as well as length and breadth of superficial activity. It is not merely a question of the additional money return which ultimately would accrue to a given effort, though that is doubtless desirable as a condition to thorough work: it is a question rather of the soil and atmosphere which nourish letters—of a friendlier and more appreciative attitude of the people towards their own literature, of the restoration of the decreasing regard for books, and of the enhancement of the self-respect and dignity of the writer. To quote from the admirable address of the Western Association of Writers in memorializing Congress in favor of the Copyright bill:

The classics of every nation should be read by every nation, but the bulk of the literature of each country should be its own, conveying its own traditions and national ideas, and inculcating the spirit of its own institutions.

For readers as well as for authors International Copyright means a declaration of American literary independence.

#### The Making of California.

WITH General Bidwell's faithful narrative in the present number THE CENTURY begins a systematic record of some of the chief features of the Anglo-Saxon movement to California, a part of the national life which has no parallel either in our own history or in that of any other country. We say "a part of the national life," for though the immediate scene of the search for gold and of the foundation of one of our

greatest commonwealths was a narrow strip of Pacific coast, the lines of sympathy and interest at that day reached to every quarter of the country, if not to every quarter of the globe. Nothing more characteristically American than this movement has been exhibited in our hundred years. The material conquest of California is not only important in itself, but as having set the pitch for the winning of the nearer West. The actual successes of that period have had their counterparts in other portions of the country; but the romance, humor, and tragedy of the California movement have an enduring and attractive individuality. Frequently in the long story one catches a discordant note, savage or sordid, but he is a superficial student of the time who does not see that it was not all for gold that the buoyant, brave, and hardy pioneers poured into the land of promise, by every practicable route, from the workshops, colleges, farms, and offices of the East. That they were not mere misers or speculators is proved by the way they spent their treasure, the yield of which, it has been calculated, cost in the mass, in labor and expenditure, dollar for dollar.

It is, therefore, not only the development of California which interests us, but the development of Californians—the broadening of a self-reliant type of American. "Get work," says the saw:

Get work; be sure 't is better far  
Than what you work to get.

Yet the spectacle of the activity of the surging crowds in the cañons of the Sierra lacks something of ideality until one ponders upon its inner motive, as shown in the entr'actes. One has only to read the newspapers of that day, or, better, to look through the volumes of "Hutchings' California Magazine," to catch the "very pulse" of the movement to California. Those pages are a sounding-board of homesick cries; they are pervaded with loneliness, with pathetic praises of home and children in prose and verse, intensified by the uncertainties of absence. Every note in the human gamut was familiar to the pioneer, but it is this lingering on the domestic note which in the retrospect gives him particular and poetic interest.

The picture of those times is a varied and salient one, full of light and shadow, and it will be the aim of our series to do justice to each. Adventure, danger, courage, heroism, and sacrifice are familiar terms to those who know the intimate life of the period, and these are thrown still more in relief against the unknown and changing conditions of a stormy experience. The events of that time are far enough away to be contemplated by this generation with the interest of novelty; and under the guidance of the pioneers themselves, led by the honored contributor of this month's paper, we hope to make our readers agreeably familiar with the pastoral life of the Spanish Californians, with the several perilous routes to the land of gold, and with the many-colored scenes in the midst of which a star of the first magnitude was added to the national flag.

## OPEN LETTERS.

### Spoiling the Egyptians.

THE traveler in Egypt is very soon confronted by the fact that Egypt is not all there. He visits the greatest ruin in the world, Karnak; the famous Hall of Ancestors has been stripped of its treasure: the bas-relief representing King Thothmes III. making offerings to threescore of his predecessors is in the Louvre. Seen on the spot such a sculpture would be of extraordinary interest and value even to the most casual student of Egyptian history. One stands in the doorway of the same hall and the great obelisk of Queen Hatasou rises before him—a reminder that her chair, recently found, is now in Manchester, England. A statue of the architect of Karnak would be a rare sight when one's thoughts were full of the glories of his work; the only one known is in Munich.

On one side of the main entrance to the Temple of Luxor, in front of the great pylon built by Rameses II., stands a single beautiful obelisk of red granite; its companion is in Paris. Of the two obelisks which formerly stood near Pompey's Pillar—the only conspicuous monument now left in Alexandria—one is on the Thames Embankment in London, while the other is being slowly reduced to powder by the climate of New York.<sup>1</sup>

At Assouan the tourist visits the granite quarries whence came most of the obelisks of Egypt. Close by was once a pillar bearing a Latin inscription, to the effect that "new quarries having been discovered near Philæ, many large pilasters and columns had been hewn from them during the reigns of Severus and Antoninus (Caracalla) and his mother Julia Domna," and that the hill was "under the guardianship of Jupiter-Ammon-Cenubis (Kneph) and Juno (Saté)," deities of Elephantiné. The inscription would be interesting to one standing on that very hill, but how carelessly is it passed by in the distant museum to which it has been removed.

Tombs are empty; not only were the mummies long since taken away by pilfering Arabs, but heavy sarcophagi, many of which might have been left in place without the possibility of injury, have been borne oversea.

Bubastis has been recently excavated, and its famous temple of Pasht is now scattered over the world—in London, Paris, Manchester, Greenock, York, Boston, Canada, and elsewhere. Bubastis is within two hours of Cairo on a main line of railway (to Ismailia on the Suez Canal), and if the interesting sculptures and statues found by M. Naville could have been kept on the ground and under proper surveillance (a less serious expense than their transportation) a museum would have been formed for the delight and instruc-

tion of visitors for all time. To-day, standing upon the elevated site of the houses of the town described by Herodotus, one looks across the bed of the broad canal which once flowed around the temple, and down upon a few scattered stones from among which nearly all of any interest have been removed. Probably no one person will ever see again all that was found at Bubastis, and the interest in the place itself is gone forever. Is it worth this to the museums which now hold the scattered fragments?

To give a list of all the Egyptian antiquities which are missing from their own land would be to reproduce the catalogue of the Egyptian exhibit of every museum in the world. A large part of these are mummies, funerary ornaments, vases, etc., of which there are thousands in existence, and such may properly be carried away to give pleasure and profit to the sight-seers of distant lands; but others are specific monuments, statues of gods and goddesses, bas-reliefs from the walls of certain tombs and temples, rare tablets, and the sarcophagi of famous kings, of every one of which there is but one.

The modern spoiling of Egypt was begun by Napoleon Bonaparte, who bore away the most precious things of a conquered land to enrich his own museums. Italy, served in the same way, has been more fortunate, and has seen many of her antiquities returned. In the time of Napoleon, before the era of railways and steamships, Egypt was farther removed from the great centers of civilization than is the interior of Australia to-day. Even forty years ago the traveler who had visited the temples of Egypt was looked upon as an explorer, and his book found a ready publisher. Then there was some reason for removing to other countries these neglected antiquities. The obelisk now in the Place de la Concorde was transplanted from the Temple of Luxor in 1831, when only the tops of the pylons and columns showed themselves here and there among the hovels of an Arab village. But to-day, thanks to the good work begun by M. Maspero, under the Egyptian government, the hovels have been swept away, the columns brought to light, and, when the work is completed, the temple will be seen in all its grandeur, but forever imperfect for want of the missing obelisk.

In this day of rapidly improving travel Egypt grows more accessible every year, and the time is not far distant when the journey from New York to Cairo will be no more serious a matter than is now the trip to Paris; and the Londoner will think nothing of running down to Luxor to spend his Christmas holidays under its warm sun. A thousand persons will visit Egypt a century hence to one to-day, and, without disparaging the heroic work of many of the excavators and the

<sup>1</sup> The following is quoted from an article in the "New York Tribune" of July 27, on the recent attempt to preserve the obelisk now standing in Central Park: "Before making the application [of the preservative] all the loose flakes on the surface were removed. They filled more than six barrels with stone, and weighed in the aggregate more than half a ton. . . . Now it

is simply a question, Professor Newberry says, how long paraffine and other preservatives can fight off the climatic attacks. If strictly cared for, the inscriptions may be retained in good condition for a century or longer. . . . The obelisk, which is now in a healthy old age, will be obliged, like everything else, to succumb at last."

grand results of their labors, it may yet come to be a matter of regret that the era of excavation could not have been contemporaneous with the day when the world would no longer think of removing the monuments from their own land and their own associations. Antiquities seen in Egypt possess an interest for even the unscientific tourist which can never be felt in the lifeless halls of the Egyptian departments of our museums.

The paramount interest in the country of the Pharaohs is not an art interest but an historical one; and its connection with the Bible, so strongly accentuated by the recent finding of the royal mummies at Deir-el-Bahari, makes it surpass all other lands in this regard. In Palestine there are only the localities to remind one of the Bible, but Egypt is full of sculptures and inscriptions which bear upon sacred history, and now the very bodies of Bible characters are being brought to light. Are we furthering historical research by scattering the tools of study throughout the world? It may be granted that much good has been done in the past and many valuable discoveries made by allowing such a document as the Rosetta Stone to rest in the British Museum within reach of the scholars of England; and the thousands of sculptures and statues in the British Museum and in other collections have done a vast educational work and have helped to interest the world in ancient Egypt. Indeed many of the more fragile monuments would probably have been destroyed long ago had they not been removed to a safe place, and before the establishment of the Museum of Egyptian Antiquities there was no such place in Egypt. Is it not time, however, to call a halt, and to provide for the preservation to Egypt, from this day forth, of all the objects she needs to make her history complete?

The exportation of antiquities by private persons has long been forbidden by law, but responsible explorers are granted permission to excavate with the understanding that a share of the result of their work shall go to the Egyptian Museum—theoretically the Museum being allowed to take whatever it pleases. But professional courtesy makes it difficult for the Museum authorities to retain the best of everything found by other explorers when the matter is left to choice, and indeed, with English influence becoming every day more paramount in Egyptian affairs, it is impossible for them to act freely. There is also too great an opportunity for the concealment of treasures, and for the carrying away to other countries of more than is needed simply to gratify a love of acquisition.

When M. Mariette, the founder of the Egyptian Museum, was in charge of the monuments, he insisted that excavations should be made only by the government of Egypt, which then furnished the necessary money. Foreign excavators were excluded, and the removal of antiquities to other countries ceased for a time. The government now provides only enough for the actual expenses of the Museum, and if new

excavations are to be made the means must be found outside of Egypt. If those interested in such work are not willing to intrust their money to the eminent commission, consisting of three Englishmen, three Egyptians, and two Frenchmen, which would at present have it in charge (provision could be made that certain approved explorers should do the work), then would it not be well to accept, with some modifications, the system of exploration which obtains in Greece? There such work by foreigners is allowed, with the restriction that absolutely no original object shall be taken from the country. Casts, squeezes, and drawings may be made, and reports published, and sometimes an explorer is granted for a certain number of years the sole right of reproduction of the objects he has excavated, and these he is allowed to sell to museums.<sup>1</sup>

The climate of Egypt is such that many objects which elsewhere would need a roof above them can there remain uncovered in the very spot where they are found. Such of the more fragile objects as need to be removed from the place of finding should be gathered into one great treasure-house, amid the climatic conditions which have already preserved them through so many centuries.

Some of the things still hidden may well be left for our successors, but we in our passing day are trustees of the monuments now known, and there is much to be done in the way of preserving, guarding, and further excavating these. Esneh, one of the most beautiful of the Ptolemaic temples, the traveler finds nearly covered with mud-huts, and with only a single great hall visible; but here the columns are so grand and the proportions so magnificent that he longs to organize a force on the spot, dig out the other halls and the sanctuary, and reveal the beauties which are only awaiting an explorer with the means.

Thirty years ago the Temple of Edfou, now the most perfect of all, was buried under forty feet of soil, and nothing was visible except the top of the pylons. M. Mariette says: "I caused to be demolished the sixty-four houses which encumbered the roof, as well as twenty-eight more which approached too near the wall of the temple. When the whole has been isolated from its present surroundings by a massive wall the work of restoration at Edfou will be accomplished." The wall is not yet built; the village huts come close to one side, and on the other side towers a heap of rubbish nearly to the top of the 125-foot pylon.

The same eminent authority tells us that "Karnak, more than any other Egyptian temple, has for a long time suffered from infiltration of the Nile, whose waters, saturated with niter, eat into the sandstone. . . . The time may come when, with crash after crash, the columns of the magnificent hypostyle hall, whose bases are already three parts eaten through, will fall, as have fallen the columns in the great court in front of it." At Karnak the earth is seven feet deep around the base of the columns, and heaps of rubbish rise close to the

<sup>1</sup> While the present law in Greece works well in the case of important monuments, yet when hundreds of small objects, almost identical, are found together, a few score of which would be sufficient for Grecian museums for all time, it becomes a matter of regret that some of these cannot be exported for the enrichment of foreign collections. The treasury of the National Museum could be benefited by the sale of articles which now only crowd its shelves in useless duplicate. So many objects found in Egypt

are of this class that a law absolutely restricting the exportation of all antiquities would not only be continually violated (without much more severe customs' examinations than are now enforced), but it would be unnecessary. The present law which allows only antiquities under the seal of the Egyptian Museum to be removed is an admirable one, but it is almost a dead letter, and it is said that £20,000 worth of antiquities are exported every year.

outer walls and almost level with their tops. Fragments, not too large to be moved with comparatively simple machinery, and the proper position of which could be accurately determined by their inscriptions, lie everywhere; heads of statues, and even parts of obelisks, could be put in place. No one who sees the results of the work done in excavating the columns of Luxor, and in some cases reconstructing parts with brick and plaster, can doubt that similar labor put upon Karnak would repay a hundred fold in our day, and it might be the means of preserving to the world its grandest ruin. A recent commission has estimated that \$15,000 spent upon Karnak will make it safe from immediate danger and practically restore it, and \$42,500 is asked for by this commission as the minimum amount imperatively needed for the preservation and protection of all the most important temples.

Egypt must be aided in guarding her treasures. There is already a system of surveillance, and a tax of one pound is levied upon every Nile traveler to contribute to the preservation of the temples. But the ignorance and cupidity of the Arab guardians is apparent to every tourist: for a sufficient *bakshish* they can easily be induced to leave the traveler while he gratifies his own private bump of acquisitiveness by chipping away a piece of sculpture or cutting out a cartouche. A trustworthy man, of some education, should be in charge of each temple, and held responsible for damages to its walls. To such a man might be intrusted the work of continuing excavations and clearing away rubbish by slow degrees, as at Pompeii, so that no great amount of money need be spent at once; and, as at Pompeii, a new element of interest would constantly be added for the tourist.

The government does all it can with the limited means at command, but Egypt is "a nation meted out and trodden down," and the movement to preserve her monuments and to keep them within her own borders as the common heritage of all nations must come from without.

William W. Ellsworth.

COMMENT.

THE original spoiling of the Egyptians history considers to have been a creditable act; but the "spoiling" by our nineteenth-century vandals in Egypt is not only discreditable but barbarous. The Egypt Exploration Fund, whose vice-president for France is Maspero, is in hearty sympathy with the English society for the preservation of the monuments of Egypt, and some of its officers have started a fund for that purpose. Its managers have repeatedly called attention to the terrible mutilation of sculptures by relic fiends or by those who fill their orders. Professor Sayce, of our Fund, and Colonel Ross write earnestly from Egypt, extracts from their letters appearing in my letter on "Civilized Barbarism," in the "Boston Post" of March 19, 1890. Mr. Ellsworth does not express as much indignation as I then expressed. I closed with these suggestions:

I hope our American press will disseminate these painful facts as to the destruction of precious historical monuments at the instance of vandals who visit Egypt, or who pay gold for monuments that must be had at any and all sacrifice. First, I hope thereby our people will be more careful how they give *carte blanche* orders for mon-

umental remains, without regard to how they are to be obtained. Secondly, that that perfection of pleasure-giving, instruction-imparting tours, a trip up the Nile, may not lose, at least in part, its infinite charm—that of the inscriptions, pictorial representations, ethnographic bas-reliefs of a great people and contemporaneous races of 2000 to 6000 years ago—to all educated people who would profit by their inspection of the remains of ancient Egypt. Lastly, that the importance of exploration and research, such as the Egypt Exploration Fund carries on, may be strikingly emphasized—and more decipherments be made ere it is too late. For its work is above as well as under ground. Professor Sayce declares that "it is evident that whatever inscriptions there are above ground in Egypt must be copied at once if they are to be copied at all."

Brimful with general sympathy for Mr. Ellsworth's views, I must yet touch judicially on a few of his special ideals and intimations. Egypt as a colossal Pompeii means a colossal and impossible fund to preserve absolutely intact her monumental treasures. Hence the museum at Cairo, to preserve the portable treasures, has a grand mission aside from its value as a great museum. Such is the greed of the Turk, Egyptian, Arab, that the greater the fund the greater would be their steals; such is iconoclasm in Egypt that it is religiously bound to deface statues and inscriptions. The most that we can accomplish, with a liberal outlay annually, will be the protection of the chief temples and sites. Let us spend \$25,000 to \$50,000 a year for this purpose; but who will give the money?

The most valuable of the portable sculptures discovered at Bubastis were removed to save them from certain destruction. There was no money for guards to protect them by night and day; much less for building a museum "for the delight and instruction of visitors for all time." The best pieces were reserved for the Cairo Museum, which always has the pick of all "finds" in Egypt, and whose director grants the right to explore for science and his museum's benefit. Most of the objects taken from Egypt by the Fund, by permission of the director, are duplicates which he does not wish, but which are of great value to other museums. Comparatively few people can see Egypt; but hundreds of thousands of people can and do see the collections elsewhere, to their great profit in many cases.

Greece is not a typical case: with fifty fold its monuments and every Greek an iconoclast, the cases would be parallel perhaps. No little triangular jealousy exists between English, French, and German savants in Egypt,—the natural *odium archaeologicum*,—some of whom are sure to let the tongue wag under the influence of the green eye. I notice that sometimes tourists' letters unwittingly catch the glitter of that eye. Let us save the monuments of Egypt; let us explore; let us use the duplicates to make our own "Egypt at Home" for study and profit; all of which is consistent and may be accomplished.

Wm. C. Winslow.

EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND, BOSTON.

General Lee and the "Yankee in Andersonville."

As a constant reader of THE CENTURY, "A Yankee in Andersonville," by Dr. T. H. Mann, comes under my observation in the July number. The article in

question seems a fair and faithful relation of facts; indeed, as I was in Lynchburg at the time he mentions, I know his account of his experience there is as he states it. Any one who experienced the necessary and often unnecessary horrors of many of the Northern "pens" where so many suffered and died can readily believe, as I do, all he says of Andersonville. But in speaking of seeing General R. E. Lee "for the first and only time in my life," he is evidently inaccurate. Dr. Mann says:

He [Lee] sat upon his horse carelessly, with one knee resting upon the pommel of the saddle, and leisurely smoking a cigar. He appeared a middle-sized man, with iron-gray hair and full gray beard, not very closely cut; as fine-looking a specimen of a man and soldier as I ever saw. He remarked, as we filed past him, "Am sorry to see you in this fix, boys, but you must make the best of it." His tone was kind, and spoken as though he really sympathized with us, as I have no doubt he did.

It is kind in Dr. Mann to think and speak thus of our Lee, but it is plain he never saw General Robert E. Lee. All who knew him will say this picture is not true to nature. "Jeb" Stuart's favorite attitude, sometimes indeed under fire, was to sit "carelessly, with one knee resting upon the pommel of his saddle," and maybe "leisurely smoking a cigar,"—though I never saw him smoke,—but General Lee never did so undignified a thing as this in his life. If there was any trait of his character that was always conspicuous it was dignity, and while on duty he was the sternest man I ever saw. In the social circle he was most courteous and affable. That he should have addressed Federal prisoners gratuitously at all was very unlike him; but if he had, it certainly would not have been in that free-and-easy, glib style quoted. It would have been very much more like him to have used the term *men*, but to have called them "boys" is altogether inconsistent. That he "sympathized" with the prisoners no one will doubt who correctly estimated the goodness and noble-heartedness of the man. His humanity and sympathy for his suffering "people"—a term of his own that he always used in speaking of his soldiers—in my humble judgment alone prevented him from being what Stonewall Jackson was, the greatest general of either army. I was connected with General Lee's army for four years nearly, and I believe if he had been a smoker I would have known it. And I am informed by one who knew General Lee better than I could that he never smoked a cigar in his life.

Very likely Dr. Mann really saw one of the many bogus counterfeits of General Lee, as I have many a time seen them attitudinizing in the conceit that they resembled him in personal appearance, which would explain some inconsistencies of an otherwise interesting and very likely faithful war reminiscence.

Dr. Mann, in speaking of his two-days' railway trip to Danville from Lynchburg (a two-hours' ride now), mentions that it was his only experience of riding in a passenger coach, "box-cars" being used on all other occasions. If he had known how few coaches there were in the Confederacy he would not have been surprised. Our troops, and indeed the sick and wounded, were from necessity nearly always transported in box-cars; and on one occasion as early as 1862, when our resources were not nearly so exhausted, I saw Jefferson Davis get out of a box-car at Gordonsville, having rid-

den from Culpeper, the only other occupants of the car being Federal prisoners captured from Pope's army.

And if Dr. Mann had known how scarce "raw corn" was as late as 1864, he would not have commented on its being issued as rations to prisoners, when very likely our soldiers in the field (many of them) were suffering even for raw corn. I could give some personal experience here in point.

One more item, which I must say with all respect is beyond my understanding, how it was possible for the prisoners at Andersonville to dig wells (not tunnels),—perpendicular wells, and a number of them,—eighty and even a hundred feet deep, in the hard clay soil, with only pieces of old canteens as digging implements. I can believe that the "mass of maggots" was "from one to two feet deep," but there must be some mistake about the depth of the wells or the pieces of canteens.

*E. A. Craighill, M. D.,  
Late Private Co. G., 2d Va. Inf'y, 1st (Stonewall) Brigade  
A. N. Va., and Ass't Surgeon C. S. A.*

LYNCHBURG, VA.

DR. MANN'S REJOINER.

It is possible, of course, that I did not see General Lee, but the picture he made sitting upon his horse in the twilight of May 5, 1864, has not yet been effaced from my mind. Dr. Craighill will agree with me that the men of either army, who stood up for four years and took the brunt of battle, were not in the habit of seeing apparitions.

The Confederate army did suffer much from lack of rations, and no doubt at times from lack even of raw corn, but the cause was lack of transportation rather than of such supplies within the Confederacy. There was corn enough rotting in the fields ungathered, and in the bins, within twenty miles of Andersonville to feed properly every prisoner in that stockade.

Why could not a well one hundred feet deep be dug with a split canteen for a shovel and an old case-knife for a pick as easily as could a tunnel? No doubt it puzzled a Virginia planter in ante-bellum days to imagine how a New England Yankee could obtain a living from the bleak and rocky hills he inhabited; yet he did it by digging away, in sunshine and rain, every day in the year except Sundays, Fourth of July, Thanksgiving, Fast Day, and "'Llection."

*T. H. Mann, M. D.,  
MILFORD, MASS. Late of Co. I., 18th Regt. Mass. Vols.*

"The Builders of the First Monitor."

As one of the executors of the late Captain John Ericsson, I feel called upon to correct some of the statements made by Mr. G. G. Benedict in his article in *THE CENTURY* for March, 1890. From documents in my possession, and facts of which I have personal knowledge, it is clear that Mr. Benedict is seriously at fault in many of his statements.

It is not true, for example, that Mr. C. S. Bushnell had less "practical experience and wealth" than his associates. His practical experience in vessels dated from his boyhood, when at sixteen years of age he was master of a large vessel, and a large owner and extensive builder in sailing and steam ships up to the time when he became contractor for the ironclad *Galena*,



of which Messrs. Winslow and Griswold were sub-contractors under him for the iron plating.

Captain Ericsson's most intimate friend, Mr. C. H. Delamater, is entitled to the credit of bringing the plan of the *Monitor* to the attention of Mr. Bushnell, who no sooner saw and appreciated it than he carried it to Hartford, Connecticut, where the Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Gideon Welles, on a certain Friday early in September, 1861, urged him to take the plan immediately to Washington and lay it before the Government. This Mr. Bushnell did, not stopping at his home in New Haven, but arriving at the capital on Sunday morning. After breakfast he invited Mr. Winslow and Mr. Griswold to take a ride with him, that he might, undisturbed, explain to them the magnitude of his discovery. To their credit it may be said that this was an easy task, and it was agreed that all three should call upon Mr. Seward and Mr. Lincoln the following (Monday) morning. Mr. Seward gave them a letter of introduction to Mr. Lincoln, and the latter was so much pleased with the plan that he promised to meet them the next day (Tuesday) at the Navy Department, and use his influence with the Naval Board for its adoption. Promptly at eleven o'clock Mr. Lincoln appeared, and, after listening to the adverse criticism, expressed his opinion that "there was something in it, as the Western girl said when she put her foot into her stocking!" After the President had withdrawn, Messrs. Bushnell and Winslow secured from Admiral Smith and Commodore Paulding a promise to sign a favorable report, provided Captain Davis — the remaining member of the committee — would join them. This he declined to do, and the enterprise seemed hopelessly blocked. Mr. Bushnell, after consulting with Secretary Welles, then started for New York, and by persistent persuasion succeeded in inducing Captain Ericsson to go on to Washington, where he had no difficulty in satisfying Captain Davis of the stability of the *Monitor*, and inducing him to join his associates in recommending a contract for its construction.

Mr. Benedict's statements, that "Days lengthened into weeks while Bushnell labored ineffectually to remove the prejudices and obtain the approval of the Board," that "His own efforts having proved thus unavailing," he applied to Messrs. Winslow and Griswold, and that they "decided to take the scheme past the Naval Board, directly to the head of the nation," etc., are wholly misleading. The fact is, that the entire enterprise was managed with the greatest expedition. The plan was never presented to the Board until the Tuesday morning when President Lincoln met Mr. Bushnell and his associates at Admiral Smith's office, and was accepted three days later, after Mr. Ericsson's arrival from New York.

"Mr. Bushnell says that [the hard conditions exacted by the Government were] never an embarrassment to Captain Ericsson and himself. If so, may it not have been because their pecuniary risk was so much less than that of their associates?"

The real reason was because of the unbounded faith which Ericsson had — and which Mr. Bushnell shared — in the ability of the vessel to do all that was required of her. It may also be said that Mr. Bushnell had secured other parties to take the place of Messrs. Winslow and Griswold in case they finally refused to sign the contract. After hesitating for a week, they

decided to share in the enterprise, but only on condition that Mr. Bushnell should secure Mr. Daniel Drew of New York and Hon. N. D. Sperry of New Haven as bondsmen for all parties. Mr. Bushnell was both able and willing to take all the risks involved in his share of the work, and has always felt more than satisfied with the public appreciation of his effort to aid the country in its darkest days. He has never had the slightest wish to appropriate the lion's share of the credit, and joins most heartily with Mr. Benedict in honoring all gentlemen whose names are given such well-earned distinction in Mr. Benedict's article.

*George H. Robinson.*

#### The Flag first hoisted at Mobile.

THE JUNE CENTURY, page 309, speaks of the flag hoisted by Lieutenant De Peyster over Richmond as "the same one that had been first hoisted at Mobile on the capture of that city."

Now the *first* flag hoisted over Mobile was hoisted by men from the ironclad *Cincinnati*. On April 12, 1865, a fleet of transports took the force that had been operating on the east side of Mobile Bay against Spanish Fort, reported to be about fifteen thousand men, over to the west side of the bay. The naval force accompanied them, ready for action. On landing, a white flag, or its equivalent, was found on every house. The citizens reported Mobile evacuated. Two boats left the *Cincinnati* to hoist a flag over one of the batteries in the harbor. The gig commanded by Acting Master J. B. Williams, executive officer, reached Battery McIntosh first and hoisted the flag there. They found everything in order except that the powder had been thrown into the bay before the evacuation. After some little time spent in rummaging, the two crews started for the city. They found no opposition to their landing, and hoisted the ensign they carried on the roof of the Battle House, climbing up on each other's shoulders to get to the flagstaff on the roof. Twenty-five minutes after our ensign was hoisted a party of cavalry came tearing in, their horses all in a foam. They went up to the roof of the custom house, across the street from the Battle House, and the first thing they saw was our flag and our men across the way. They were chagrined, and set up the flag they bore against a chimney, where it could not be seen from the street. Our men went over and helped them hoist it where it could be properly seen, then we took down our ensign and returned to the ship. Our flag was hoisted while the mayor was surrendering the city.

*Ambrose S. Wright,*  
Late Clerk to the Commander of the "*Cincinnati*."  
LINDEN, MICHIGAN.

#### A Letter from Lincoln when in Congress.

THE following copy of an autograph letter of Congressman Abraham Lincoln to the Hon. Josephus Hewett of Natchez, Mississippi, evinces a spirit of fairness and kindly feeling towards the South, and may be found of interest to readers of THE CENTURY. The original is in possession of Mrs. M. E. Gilkey of this place.

DUNCANSBY, MISS.

*L. L. Gilkey.*

WASHINGTON, February 13, 1848.

DEAR HEWETT: Your Whig representative from Mississippi, P. W. Tompkins, has just shown me a

letter of yours to him. I am jealous because you did not write to me—perhaps you have forgotten me. Don't you remember a long black fellow who rode on horseback with you from Tremont to Springfield nearly ten years ago, swimming our horses over the Mackinaw on the trip? Well, I am that same one fellow yet. I was once of your opinion, expressed in your letter, that presidential electors should be dispensed with, but a more thorough knowledge of the causes that first introduced them has made me doubt. The causes were briefly these. The convention that framed the Constitution had this difficulty: the small States wished to so form the new government as that they might be equal to the large ones, regardless of the inequality of population; the large ones insisted on equality in proportion to population. They compromised it by basing the House of Representatives on *population*, and the Senate on States regardless of population, and the execution of both principles by electors in each State, equal in number to her senators and representatives. Now throw away the machinery of electors and this compromise is broken up and the whole yielded to the principle of the larger States. There is one thing more. In the slave States you have representatives, and consequently electors, partly upon the basis of your slave population, which would be swept away by the change you seem to think desirable. Have you ever reflected on these things?

But to come to the main point. I wish you to know that I have made a speech in Congress, and that I want you to be *enlightened* by reading it; to further which object I send you a copy of the speech by this mail.

For old acquaintance' sake, if for nothing else, be sure to write to me on receiving this. I was very near forgetting to tell you that on my being introduced to General Quitman and telling him I was from Springfield, Illinois, he at once remarked, "Then you know my valued friend, Hewett of Natchez"; and on being assured I did, he said just such things about you as I like to hear said about my own valued friends.

Yours as ever,

A. LINCOLN.

#### Horace Greeley at Lincoln's First Nomination.

ON reading "The Inside Facts of Lincoln's Nomination" in the July CENTURY, I am reminded that I was in that large house in the Chicago "Wigwam" the day Lincoln was nominated, and was very desirous of the nomination of William H. Seward, as were a large number with me from Wisconsin. After the nomination of Mr. Lincoln, before proceeding to the nomination of Vice-President, the convention adjourned until the afternoon. I went from the convention to the Tremont House. Shortly after arriving there Horace Greeley came into the reception hall of the hotel with some of his friends. I then thought his face never showed more feeling of triumphant satisfaction than his political antagonist was defeated, that Seward and Thurlow Weed were humbled. I noticed this the more as I knew of the bitter feeling existing between Greeley and Seward and Weed.

Mr. Greeley's friends were gathering around him in the hall, congratulating him on the result. I heard one ask him: "Now what next? Who is it best to bring forward for Vice-President?" Mr. Greeley said, "The friends of Mr. Seward are very sore, and they must

have their own way as to Vice-President." On being asked if he had in his mind the proper name, Mr. Greeley put his open hand to the side of his mouth and in an undertone said, "Hamlin of Maine"; and Mr. Hamlin was nominated in the afternoon.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COL.

G. H. Stewart.

#### An Error in "A Single Tax upon Land."

IN his article on "A Single Tax upon Land," in the July CENTURY, Mr. Edward Atkinson says:

It was presented more than a century since by the economists of France known as the physiocrats; it was applied in France under Turgot, before the French Revolution, with very disastrous results.

This is a remarkable statement for a man to make who "has endeavored, to the best of his ability, to explore the subject," for the proposition of the physiocrats holds about the same relation to the modern proposition as Fulton's steamboat holds to the *Umbria*. Besides, it was not applied by Turgot, though he attempted an approach to it, and as a result he was swept out of power by the privileged classes whose monopolies were threatened.

Henri Van Laun says in "The French Revolutionary Epoch," Vol. I., p. 35:

At all events, Turgot, "the man with the brain of a Bacon and the heart of a Chancellor de L'Hôpital," is regarded as the likely savior of France. His fame had preceded him, and this led the people to expect a renewal of administrative marvels, such as his intendantship of Limoges brought to light. If regeneration without a revolution had been possible for France, Turgot would have accomplished it. Plans vast and numerous, comprising everything the Revolution afterwards effected, were incubated: the abolition of feudal rights, of laboring upon the highways, vexatious restrictions of the salt system, interior imposts, liberty of conscience and of the press, unfettered commerce and industry, disestablishment of the monastic orders, revision of criminal and civil codes, uniformity of weights and measures, and many others.

When at last Parliament was convened (see p. 41),

to them Turgot, with honest straightforward eloquence, unfolds his scheme. "No bankruptcy, no increase of imposts, no loans"; to which are added free trade in corn, the abolition of gilds, and last, but not least, equality of territorial imposts for all. What matters it to them that in less than two years, with provisional measures of this kind, he has paid twenty-four million francs to the public creditors, redeemed twenty-eight millions of installed money, and moreover discharged fifty millions of debt. Let him do so again, but not ask them to abate one iota of their privileges. They refuse to be taxed like the common herd; they consider such demand preposterous, and flatly decline to listen to it.

As a last resort Turgot prevails upon the king to register the edicts in a bed of justice, but the pressure of the privileged classes is so great that Turgot is compelled to resign (p. 44).

Good Malesherbes, Turgot's trusty helper, disgusted with all these vile cabals, voluntarily quits the Ministry; the latter, more courageous, waits until he is sent away, uttering these memorable words at his first dismissal: "Sire, the destiny of kings led by courtiers is that of Charles I."

Says John Morley, "Critical Miscellanies," Vol. II., pp. 150-151:

He suppressed the corvées and he tacked the money payment which was substituted on the Twentieths—an impost from which the privileged classes were not exempt.

This was about as near to the *impôt unique* as the privileged classes permitted him to get.

Leon Say in his work on Turgot, Anderson's translation (p. 205), says:

Calonne's territorial subvention, bearing upon all land owners and upon all estates without exception or privilege, was nothing more than the land tax of which Turgot was developing the plan at the very moment of his dismissal, and which was to have been the object of his next reform.

James Middleton.

NEW ORLEANS.

MR. ATKINSON'S CORRECTION.

MR. JAMES MIDDLETON'S Open Letter, which I am glad to see in print, gives me the opportunity to correct the error in my article on the "Single Tax upon Land" and in the rejoinder to Mr. Henry George, to which Mr. Middleton refers.

The single tax, or what the physiocrats call *l'impôt unique*, was not applied in France under Turgot; that is, it was not put into practice. The services which Turgot rendered are rightly and fully stated in the extracts given by Mr. Middleton. *L'impôt unique*, or the single tax advocated by the physiocrats, may or may not have been of the same nature as the single tax on land valuation now proposed by Mr. Henry George. It was, however, based upon the same idea, in which Turgot shared, that all wealth is derived from land.

I may rightly give an explanation as to how this error crept into my copy and into THE CENTURY. You may remember that the first draft of this article upon the "Single Tax upon Land" was submitted to you, and while you liked it and desired to publish it, it was too long; neither did it satisfy myself that it was in a sufficiently popular form to be easily comprehended.

In that original draft I attributed the issue of the

French *assignats*, the paper money of the French Revolution which collapsed in such a disastrous manner although secured upon the confiscated lands of the nobles, to the misconception in regard to land which had been held by the physiocrats and sustained or applied by Turgot. In making the necessary excision I overlooked the fact that I left the statement in an incorrect form, as if a single tax on land valuation, corresponding to the plan of Mr. George, had been actually put into practice in France. This is not the fact; and the simplest way is to admit the error. Even when writing my short rejoinder to Mr. George, I failed to observe that by my excision I had left the paragraph in its erroneous form.

Edward Atkinson.

BOSTON.

George D. Prentice and S. S. Prentiss.

MR. JOHN GILMER SPEED writes to us that although Mr. Joseph Jefferson's remarks as to Mr. Prentice's dueling prowess reflect the opinion of others with better opportunities to judge, nevertheless Mr. Prentice was bravely and consistently opposed to what he called "the miserable code that is said to require two men to go out and shoot at each other for what one of them may consider a violation of etiquette or punctilio in the use of language." Mr. Speed says: "Mr. Prentice had on more than one occasion to defend himself from attacks made upon him in the streets, but he was never the aggressor in such fights."

With regard to S. S. Prentiss (who, by the way, was lawyer, orator, and statesman, but not an editor), letters from lawyers state that while he did fight two duels with General Foote, he fought no others, and was really opposed to the practice; yielding in these cases to what Dr. Nott in his sermon on the death of Hamilton termed "the force of an imperious custom."

## BRIC-À-BRAC.

### The Present Style.

JONES, Smith, Robinson,  
Simmons, Kent, Parr,  
Riley, Moore, Grant, Dunn,  
Little, Lillie, Carr,

Marsh, Dusenbury, Bland,  
Hurley, Murphy, Daw,  
And Jamison, Attorneys and  
Counselors at law.

R. K. Munkittrick.

### Observations.

To know a thing we must see it as a whole; to understand it we must see it as a part.

WHETHER I shall be unfortunate depends also on others; whether I shall be unhappy depends only on myself.

EVEN mine enemy can sympathize with my grief; but only my friend can sympathize with my joy.

HEAVEN is a place into which the more I push others the more I am led myself.

TWO men have no need of philosophy—those who have no leisure for it, and those who have.

Ivan Panin.

### Some Bookish Rhymes.

#### AN UNCUT COPY.

WHEN I was young I sent my friend a copy of "My Verses,"

And when he died he left his books to me, dear to his heart.

To-day I looked them over all, and find—ten thousand curses!—

My book is there and no two leaves have e'er been cut apart.

#### AN INCONSISTENCY.

THE bibliophile who loves his margins wide—

Who grudges e'en to type an inch or two—

Most strangely has not ever stepped aside

To read with glee a virgin blank-book through.

#### THE GRANGERITE.

HE says he 's fond of books as of himself—

This man who never yet has hesitated

To hack and cut a dozen books for pelf

Wherewith *one* may be extra-illustrated!

John Kendrick Bangs.

## TOPICS OF THE TIME.

### Some Christmas Reflections.

PERHAPS our readers may find as much of the true Christian feeling in Dr. Abbott's article, and in the article on the Record of Virtue, as in the more ostensibly Christmas "features" of this number of THE CENTURY. Good people of other religions sometimes resent the Christian habit of insisting that all the modern and civilized agencies and enthusiasms for the bettering of humanity are essentially Christian. We can imagine the smile that must have illuminated the countenances of some of our Hebrew friends when, after the death of Montefiore, certain Christian doctors of divinity generously undertook to overcome, in various learned essays, the theological difficulties as to the entrance of that great benefactor into the rewards of Heaven. It was, we remember, the kindly and timely enterprise of one of our religious weeklies that set these good doctors to work; and we have no doubt that St. Peter of the Keys was greatly indebted to them for promptly pointing out a legitimate escape from an extremely awkward situation.

But Christians should not be blamed, after all, for finding in their religion the potency of all good. It is the distinction of Christianity that spiritual progress and good works go hand in hand in its system, rightly understood. The solitary, selfish, soul-saving, hermit view of the Christian life is a remnant of other religions and as far as possible from the true "imitation of Christ." In Professor Drummond's remarkable sermon on "The Greatest Thing in the World" perhaps the most striking passage is this: "Have you ever noticed how much of Christ's life was spent in doing kind things—in *merely* doing kind things? Run over it with that in view, and you will find that he spent a great proportion of his time simply in making people happy, in doing good turns to people." We know of a good man who would probably deprecate the title of "Christian," yet who, when thanked for some notable act of thoughtful kindness to a whole schoolful of boys, said that he deserved no thanks at all, because he had only acted on the principle he had long ago discovered, that "if you want happiness yourself in this world you must disseminate happiness."

But the Christian idea includes along with the dissemination of happiness also the dissemination of misery—misery to evil-doers. "And Jesus entered into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold the doves; and he saith unto them, It is written, My house shall be called a house of prayer: but ye make it a den of robbers." It was doubtless with a view to this phase of the energy of the highest example of the Christian life that clergymen in the city of New York and in the State of Pennsylvania entered with such zeal into the moral issues of the campaigns of last month. Nothing that our spiritual leaders have done in our day has been more effective in increasing the respect of the general community for their sincerity

and godliness. For, let us remember in this Christmas season of beneficence, of mutual kindnesses and of happiness, that Christianity is not only a religion of love, but a religion of hatred—of love for God and man, and hatred of all the evils in human character and in the entire social economy.

### Trees in America.

WE spoke in the November CENTURY—and not by any means for the first time—of the meaning of forest preservation and of its importance as a factor in the future welfare of our country. Since that number went to press the proposed Yosemite National Park, described in our September number, has become a reality by the enactment of General Vandever's bill. By this result, for which the people of the country are largely indebted to the activity of Mr. Holman of the House of Representatives and of Mr. Plumb of the Senate, not only an important addition is made to the area of wonderful scenery reserved for public use, but an end is put, within considerable limits, to the depredations of lumbermen and sheep-herders. Another important gain, and one of great practical value, is the protection which this new reservation insures to the headwaters of the San Joaquin, Merced, and Tuolumne rivers—thus not only insuring a larger and steadier flow of the cataracts and falls of these streams, but conserving the water supply of the foothills and valleys below. Not less important was the passage by the Senate of the resolution of Senator Plumb, directing the Secretary of the Interior to make a prompt and careful report in regard to the spoliation of the Yosemite. The Secretary has shown an active interest in the new public reservations of California, and there is every reason to believe that he will make a searching investigation into these only too well proved abuses. In doing this it is greatly to be hoped that he will avail himself of the services of some capable and disinterested landscape architect of reputation. Happily there are several in the country who would meet the requirements of the occasion.

A very important measure is still pending, and should surely be acted upon favorably by the present Congress. We refer to the Act for the Protection and Maintenance of the Yellowstone National Park, which has passed the Senate and is now before the House of Representatives, having been reported favorably from the Committee on Public Lands. This bill, if we are not mistaken, has in fact passed the Senate four times, and is apparently only opposed by a lobby in the interest of a railroad scheme.

Unquestionably a wider and deeper interest in the general subject of forest preservation is now felt than was felt a few years ago, and the nature of the measures, public, corporate, and private, which will best insure the protection of our woodlands is more clearly understood. But much enlightenment, and especially much awakening of enthusiasm, are needed if the nation as a whole is to do its duty in forest preservation and also in the guarding of particularly beautiful passages

of scenery and exceptionally fine pieces of woodland or individual trees. Cold wisdom may do much; a genuine interest in Nature's productions, an enthusiastic love for them, can do more. To keep what will serve us is one motive; to keep what delights us is quite another; and both must work together in this case if we wish not only to do the best for ourselves but to respect the lawful rights of posterity.

Now, really to love a thing we must know it. There is no way in which a vital interest in it can be quickly and surely excited except by changing a vague and imperfect knowledge of its qualities into full and accurate knowledge. It is not the casual summer tourist, but the landscape gardener, who knows how impossible it is to create a bit of landscape like Nature's best, that protests most vigorously against the desecration of such bits. It is the botanist, the dendrologist, the trained student and practised lover of Nature, who cries out most loudly against the folly of mountain denudation — not the farmer or manufacturer, though his may be the material interests immediately at stake. To save our forests and landscapes and administer them wisely we must love them, and to love them we must know them. But those who have traveled farthest among them best understand how difficult it is to gain real acquaintance with them. Who among the other travelers or the residents we meet can tell us about our trees — whether a species is common or rare, what is its natural range, what is its adaptability to cultivation in other places, what the value of its various products, what its relative importance among the score of other species around it? And where are the books from which we can gather such information?

In fact, the first volume of the first book to meet the wants of Americans in this important direction has just been published. But the work promises to be, when complete in its twelve volumes, so adequate to every need, scientific and popular, that it merits an especially hearty welcome.

The time was ripe for an exhaustive and accurate survey of the arborescent species of our country, but only just ripe. Until the great West had been opened up in all directions by the railway, no botanical collector could feel sure that he had reaped the full riches of its forests, no systematic botanist could regard the families and genera of North American trees as more than provisionally established. Fortunately the advent of the time of full knowledge is now being recorded by a dendrologist who has played an important part in bringing it about. Professor Sargent's connection with the North Transcontinental Survey, his journeys in the service of the National Government when charged with the preparation of that volume of the Tenth Census Reports which treats of the forests of our country, his work in forming the Jesup Collection of Woods in the New York Museum of Natural History, and his present position as director of the Arnold Arboretum, which he has made the richest dendrological collection in America and to which he has given international scientific importance — all these labors furnished him with unequalled opportunities to fit himself for writing "The Silva of North America"; and he tells us in his preface that during them all the intention to write it was steadily in his mind. No one else, at home or abroad, was so well equipped as Professor Sargent to do this special piece of work.

His book, as we have implied, will replace no existing work — it will fill a crying vacancy. All that had previously been written about American trees was either fragmentary or to some degree incorrect; and the best of it was hidden away from the ken of the public in botanical monographs or the files of scientific journals. The only general work which could rightly pretend to the name of a *Silva* of North America has been the one first published by Michaux in 1810, and supplemented in 1842 by Nuttall; and this, of course, is sadly antiquated — incomplete in scope, and imperfect even as far as it goes. Other *Silvas* have been begun and not finished, or have been mere incorrect compilations from the writings of various authors. Even local handbooks, like Emerson's "Trees and Shrubs of Massachusetts," have not been numerous or often good. No botanist has hitherto been able fully and accurately to compute, distinguish, and understand our trees. No horticulturist or landscape gardener has had it in his power to select among all the species possible of cultivation in a given locality. No architect or cabinet-maker has had an explanatory list of all the woods he might advantageously use. And the lover of Nature has been perpetually balked of his wish to identify the species he has found in his travels. Nothing was more needed in our literature than a complete and detailed work, written from first-hand observation, which should systematize our trees for the scientific student and explain and illustrate their appearance and qualities for the public.

#### The Railway Zone-Tariff of Hungary.

THE extent to which the nations of the earth are sharing one another's life is illustrated not merely by the economic exchanges which no barriers of hostile legislation quite succeed in suppressing, but also by the contributions of political and industrial experience which each is making for the benefit of all. Some of the most useful of these come from quarters to which we might not have looked for original suggestions. For the method of ballot reform which is so widely adopted we are indebted to Australia; and now from Hungary we have a suggestion of reform in railway management which promises to revolutionize the passenger business.

The "Zone-tariff," as it is called, was put in operation in Hungary on the 1st of August, 1889. It has, therefore, but a brief experience to justify its practicability; but the results thus far have been so remarkable that its success seems to be assured. The method consists of a division of the territory of Hungary into fourteen concentric zones, Budapest, the capital, being the center. The first zone includes all stations within 25 kilometers — 16½ miles — from the center; the second, all more than 25 and less than 40; all the zones except the first, the twelfth, and the thirteenth are 15 kilometers, or a little more than 9 miles in width; the three named are 25 kilometers in breadth, and the fourteenth includes all stations more than 225 kilometers from the capital. The fare is regulated by the number of zones which the traveler enters or crosses during his journey. Reducing guldens to cents, the rate is 20, 16, and 10 cents per zone, for first, second, and third class passengers respectively. If one starts from Budapest and crosses three zones he travels,

therefore, 55 kilometers, or about 34 miles: if he goes first-class, his fare will be 60 cents; if second-class, 48 cents; if third-class, 30 cents.

For local traffic, when the traveler does not cross the boundary of any zone, there are special rates; if he goes only to the nearest station, the charges will be 12, 6, and 4 cents; if to the second station from his starting-point, 16, 9, and 6 cents; if to the third station, the full rates of the zone are charged.

The greatest reduction, however, is in the long distances. For all stations more than 225 kilometers — 150 miles — from Budapest the rates are the same. All stations beyond that distance are reckoned in the fourteenth zone. It costs no more to travel from Budapest to Brasso, which is 729 kilometers distant, than to Nagy Varad, the distance of which is only 245 kilometers. To this farthest point, 442 miles from the capital, the fares of the three classes are, for ordinary trains, \$3.20, \$2.32, and \$1.60. At this rate the first-class fare from New York to Chicago would be only about \$7.00, and the third-class fare about \$3.50.

The former rates of the Hungarian railways between the two points now under consideration were \$16.84, \$11.56, and \$7.68. The fare is, therefore, less than one-fifth of what it was under the old system.

It is in these long distances that the reduction is most sweeping; but even the shorter journeys are greatly cheapened. To Arad, which is 253 kilometers from Budapest, the former fare for the three classes was \$6.16, \$4.32, and \$3.08; the present fare is \$3.20, \$2.32, and \$1.60, a reduction of almost 50 per cent.

Besides the reduction in rates, the new system offers great advantages in the way of convenience and simplification. The number of distinct tickets always kept on sale in every important hotel office was formerly about 700; the greatest number required in any office is now only 92. This reduces considerably the expense of printing and of handling tickets. They are now sold like postage stamps, at news-stands, post-offices, hotels, cigar-shops, and other such places. Any traveler knows what his fare will be if he knows how many zones he is to cross; he simply multiplies the number of the zones he is to enter or cross by the normal rate of fare per zone, which is, as has been explained, twenty, sixteen, and ten cents for the three classes respectively.

For a large number of places within fifty-five kilometers of Budapest ticket-books containing from thirty to sixty tickets are issued at rates still lower. Thus for a group of stations averaging about twenty-one miles from Budapest books are sold which make the trip fares sixteen, twelve, and eight cents. These books are transferable, and the owner of the book may pay with these tickets the fares of persons accompanying him. Evidently the purpose of this system is to extend these concessions and conveniences as widely as possible, and not, as often in America, to limit and circumscribe them so that the smallest number of people shall get the advantage of them.

The reader will be interested in knowing what re-

sponse has been made by the Hungarian public to these liberal measures. The Hungarian public is not particularly responsive, the population of the country is sparse, they are a poor, unenterprising, home-keeping people; but they seem to know a good thing when they see it. The increase in the passenger traffic has been very great. For the first eight months of the new system the number of passengers carried was 7,770,876; for the corresponding months of the previous year the number carried was 2,891,332. It may be supposed that this increase was mainly due to the great reduction in the long-distance rates. On the contrary, the gain is the largest in the traffic between neighboring stations. Of such passengers there were under the old system 255,000; under the new, 4,367,586.

This vast increase of business has also been accompanied by a substantial increase of revenues. Comparing the receipts from passengers and baggage of the first six months of the new system with the corresponding months of the previous year, we find a gain of \$361,880. It is also stated that there has been no material increase in operating expenses. Under the old system the cars were not often more than one-third full.

It is not to be wondered at that railway managers from all parts of the world are hastening to Hungary to study on the ground this remarkable phenomenon. It is to be hoped that some of our own may go and return with new light on a great question.

To what extent the experience of Hungary could be made available in America it is not easy to say. Part of the Hungarian railways belong to the state, but part of them are under the control of private companies; it would appear, however, that the right of the state to regulate fares must be conceded. The document from which this information is derived is published by the Hungarian government, and it consists of an elaborate but very intelligible compilation of the rules and methods of classification under which the business is done.

One fact is clearly demonstrated—that reduced passenger fares greatly stimulate passenger traffic, and are advantageous to the companies. There are indications enough of this fact in the experience of American railways, but the managers are slow to act upon them. Perhaps this striking illustration from Hungarian railway history may quicken their apprehension.

The economic and industrial advantages of such low fares should be obvious to all. Whatever tends to promote the mobility of labor is in the interest of thrift and peace. Especially is this true in these times when through changes of fashion production is constantly shifting: if the work-people thrown out of employment in one place could easily and cheaply remove to some other place where laborers are wanted, suffering would be relieved, pauperism diminished, and the congestions of labor, out of which many difficulties arise, greatly reduced. The high rates of railroad fare prevent the free movement of labor, and aggravate many of our social ills.

## OPEN LETTERS.

### Election by the Majority.

THE acknowledged purpose of an election is to register the will of those who vote.

As there are different types of people, so there are many wills in any given community. The wills vary and are divided, or, perhaps more properly, formed into groups by various circumstances, such as interest, education, locality, habits of thought, and the like. These groups should have some means of asserting themselves, and such means should, as far as possible, give weight to their views in proportion to the numerical strength of each.

Our present methods of election are not conducive to the expression and registration of the different shades of political opinion. They tend rather to suppress than to recognize such difference. This is so far true, and the votes of small parties are so certain to prove ineffectual, that they are said to be cast into the air. It has frequently happened that many of the votes thus lost were cast on principle and by the most advanced thinkers for the time being. Such votes are apt to be conscience votes, and the loss of conscience votes is a serious loss to the State.

At present we have two kinds of elections with reference to the number of officers to be elected — single and plural. Single elections are those where a single person is chosen to office by the electors of a particular district, such as a governor, a mayor, and the like. Plural elections are those where several officers of the same class or grade are chosen on general ticket from the same district, as is the case with presidential elections.

While these methods differ in the form of the ticket, that may be said to be the only difference. In the one case a majority or plurality elects the single officer, in the other case the same majority or plurality elects all the officers on the general ticket, be they few or many. Should there chance to be more than two tickets in the field, they might receive almost an equal vote, but the ticket having the largest number by one vote would be elected.

I have assumed that the right to govern resides in the majority. This right to rule may be effectuated in two ways.

*First.* By securing the election of the single officer who is to rule.

*Second.* By securing the election of the major part of an official body composed of several members, such as legislative bodies. In the latter case only is a representation of both the majority and minority possible. But I shall here speak of the single election only. Mr. Hare's system of election and others have referred more particularly to plural elections.

A perfect election is a unanimous election. In such case no vote can be said to have been lost or to be ineffectual. In proportion as an election varies from this standard it is imperfect. But so long as an election is permitted by less than the whole number of votes, so long will ineffectual votes be cast.

The method of election here presented is designed more exactly to ascertain and register the will of the persons voting; to reduce, as far as possible, the num-

ber of ineffectual votes, and to aid the majority to unite on the choice of a single officer. Before describing the method in detail, it may be well first to define two words as very commonly used in politics, viz. : majority and plurality. The former means more than one-half of all the votes cast. The latter ordinarily means a number of votes cast for any candidate which is greater than the number cast for any other candidate, though generally less than a majority. For example, if A receives fifty-one votes and B forty-nine, A is said to have a majority. If A receives thirty-three, B thirty-three, and C thirty-four, C is said to have a plurality.

In endeavoring to improve our system of election care must be taken to command the confidence of the people. Radical changes will not be favored. A system should be such that the votes cast can be returned in a form convenient for examination, that the public may compute and ascertain for itself the result of an election. For these reasons only a comparatively slight change in present methods is here proposed, viz. : that each voter be allowed to add to his ballot the name of his second-choice candidate, to be considered and counted only in case the candidate of his first choice fails of an election.

This method can be easily understood by the voter as it simply gives him the privilege of a second choice. It allows him to say: I desire to vote for A if he can be elected, and if he cannot let my vote be counted for B. The manner of making the preference known is quite immaterial. It may be done by the order in which the names are placed on the ballot or otherwise. Where the Australian method of voting is used, the voter could indicate his first and second choice by placing appropriate characters, such as 1 and 2, opposite the names of the candidates of his first and second choice.

The next step under this system of election would be the making of proper returns. Had the voter the privilege of making three choices the returns would be much more complicated, while a fourth choice would still further multiply complications. As the voter cannot go beyond the second choice, the returns can be made with comparative ease. Of course the second choice would add somewhat to the labor of the canvassers under present methods, if returns were made of the second choice. But as it would not be necessary to consider the second choice except where there was no majority on the first choice, it might not be thought necessary on the first canvass to make any return of the second-choice votes. Probably, however, it would be better to have both the first and second choice votes counted and registered in the regular returns, that all may know the exact result.

In canvassing the vote, ballots would be first assorted into piles, one pile for each candidate having a first-choice vote. The number of ballots in any given pile would be the number of votes that particular candidate received on first choice, and would be so entered in the returns. Thereafter the various piles of ballots could be re-assorted in like manner according to the second choice and the results entered accordingly. The returns could then, for example, be tabulated thus :

FIRST CHOICE.	SECOND CHOICE.			
	A.	B.	C.	Blank.
A. .... 7 .....	..... 1 .....	..... 6 .....	..... 0 .....	..... 0
B. .... 20 .....	..... 7 .....	..... 10 .....	..... 3 .....	..... 3
C. .... 18 .....	..... 5 .....	..... 7 .....	..... 6 .....	..... 6

In such a form it may be seen that one line would indicate two things: 1. The number of votes cast for a particular candidate on the first choice. 2. Exactly how the voters casting those ballots desire their votes to be distributed among the other candidates as second choice, in case their first-choice candidate should fail to be elected.

Before considering the manner of ascertaining the result of an election by means of the second-choice votes it may be well to examine as a whole the returns as given above. They show: 1. That no candidate received a majority on the first choice. 2. That all who voted did not care to make a second choice. 3. That the form of the returns shows exactly how the voters who voted for each candidate on their first choice distributed their votes on second choice. 4. That under the present method of election B would be elected by a plurality vote, notwithstanding A's and C's supporters might prefer some one else. 5. That if the voters who cast their first-choice votes for A could be counted according to their second choice, C would be credited with six additional votes, and B with one additional vote, making B's total 21 and C's 24.

The returns being completed in the form above given the result of the election would remain to be ascertained. In case any candidate should have a majority of all the first-choice votes it would be useless to pursue our inquiry any further, for the majority must rule and elect its candidate. If, on the other hand, no candidate should receive a majority on the first choice, it would be apparent that the will of the majority of the voters could not be ascertained by considering only the first-choice votes. But as we are enabled to read the will of the voters by means of the second choice, we know how they desire their votes to be counted in case their first choice should prove ineffectual. The important point, however, would be the determination of what votes should be treated as ineffectual.

That first-choice votes may have effect as far as possible, it is proposed to distribute according to their second choice the votes cast for the candidate receiving the smallest number of first-choice votes. This would require, in our preceding example, that the votes cast for A on the first choice be counted according to the second choice. As we have seen, this would give B one additional vote and C six additional votes, making B's total 21 and C's total 24. C would then have a clear majority of all the votes cast, and would be elected.

Should no candidate receive a clear majority after the distribution of the votes originally cast for the candidate receiving the smallest number of votes on the first choice, the same process would have to be repeated as to the candidate having the next smallest number of votes to his credit, until such was the result or until only two candidates were left, when the one having the greater number of votes would necessarily be declared elected.

The rules for the election of a single officer may be stated as follows:

*Voter's Rule.*— Let each voter place on his ballot the names of two candidates most acceptable to him, indicating his preference.

*Making Returns.*— Canvass the ballots and make returns in the form heretofore given.

In that form they will show: 1. How many ballots are cast for each candidate as a first choice. 2. How many of that number are cast for each other candidate as a second choice. In other words, it will appear how many voters have supported each particular candidate as first choice, and how his supporters distribute their support on second choice.

*Ascertaining Result.*— 1. If the name of any candidate stands as first choice on a majority of all the ballots cast, he is elected.

2. If no candidate is thus elected, to the number of first-choice votes cast for the respective candidates (except the one having the least number) add the number of second-choice votes cast for each candidate by those voters who have voted for the candidate having the least number of first-choice votes.

3. If no candidate thus secures a majority, the process must be repeated (distributing each time according to their second choice the votes of the voters who voted on the first choice for the candidate who has the least number of votes to his credit) until such is the result, or until only two candidates remain, when the one having the greater number of votes to his credit will be elected by a majority or plurality, as the case may be.

That the method of ascertaining the result may be more clearly understood, I will endeavor to illustrate by means of the returns of the mayoralty election of 1888 in the city of New York. The figures given as the first choice show the actual vote in round numbers. The figures given to indicate the second choice are of course purely arbitrary. Let us assume that at the last mayoralty election the above described system was in use, that the votes were on first and second choice distributed as shown by the following supposed returns, and that we desired to ascertain the result.

FIRST CHOICE.	SECOND CHOICE.					
	Grant.	Erhardt.	Hewitt.	Coogan.	Jones.	Blanks.
Grant.... 114,000..	..... 10,000..	..... 75,000..	..... 25,000..	..... 1,000..	..... 3,000	
Erhardt.. 73,000.. 10,000..	..... 60,000..	..... 1,000..	..... 1,000..	..... 1,000		
Hewitt... 71,000.. 10,000.. 50,000..	..... 6,000..	..... 1,000..	..... 4,000			
Coogan... 9,000.. 2,000.. 1,000.. 5,000..	..... 100..	..... 900				
Jones.... 2,000.. 500.. 100.. 1,000.. 300..	..... 100					

After adding together all the first-choice votes, we find that there were 269,000, of which number 134,501 constitute a majority. As no candidate has received so large a number of votes, we proceed (Rule 2) to add to the number of first-choice votes cast for the respective candidates (save the one having the least number) the number of second-choice votes cast for each candidate by those voters who have voted for the candidate having the least number of first-choice votes. This would remove Jones from the contest and give to Grant, Erhardt, Hewitt, and Coogan each an additional number of votes according to the popularity of each among the original supporters of Jones. Their amounts would then stand: Grant, 114,000+500=114,500; Erhardt, 73,000+100=73,100; Hewitt, 71,000+1000=72,000; Coogan, 9000+300=9300.

As no candidate yet appears to have a majority, the process must be repeated (Rule 3), distributing this time, according to their second choice, the votes cast for Coogan, as he is the candidate who has the least



number of votes to his credit. Thus we find the supporters of Coogan, by means of their second-choice votes, contribute 2000 additional votes to Grant; 1000 to Erhardt, and 5000 to Hewitt, making their totals: Grant, 116,500; Erhardt, 74,100; and Hewitt, 77,000.

Still there is no majority, and there are more than two candidates in the field. The process must be repeated once more (Rule 3). Again proceeding to distribute according to their second choice the votes of those voting for the candidate having the least number of votes to his credit, Erhardt's supporters contribute 10,000 additional votes to the credit of Grant, and 60,000 to the credit of Hewitt, making their totals: Grant, 126,500, and Hewitt, 137,000. This would give Hewitt an election by the majority of all the votes cast. If, however, he had received less than 134,501 votes, but a larger number than Grant, he would still be elected, but by a plurality vote.

As the figures above given are not intended to be based on probabilities, it is left for those claiming political sagacity to work out for themselves, if they desire to do so, what would have been the result of that election had it been conducted under the foregoing plan.

Tests of this method can easily be made in any voluntary association where the same points would arise as upon the application of the plan to popular elections.

Such a system of election can, I believe, be instituted in this State of New York, as well as in many others, simply by an act of the legislature and without any constitutional amendment.

*Daniel S. Remsen.*

NEW YORK CITY.

#### Higher Education: a Word to Women.

"Behold, I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it."

THE door has been opened; women are pressing to the front, crowding the ranks and filling the avenues once open only to men; they have entered the struggle, competing on equal terms and side by side with the stronger sex, making themselves the bread-winners, and doing the actual work of the world—in a word, taking active, intelligent, and resolute part in the march and progress of humanity. It seems almost as if a new race had been created, a new tide of being had set in, and new forces had been called into play, beginning a new era in the world's history, and—if woman so wills it—the moral and social regeneration of mankind. But before taking possession of the kingdom which is hers she would do well to pause for a moment on the height already gained and carefully scan the horizon, looking with her own eyes clearly into the past and clearly into the future so as to discern its whole drift and significance; bringing to bear her own independent judgment and insight upon the world as it is—as men have made it—and upon the world as it may be and as woman may help to make it, if she will trust her own genius and prerogative as woman—something other than man—over and above any calling or profession she may choose to adopt. In the enthusiasm for a new cause certain watchwords are caught up that fire the imagination, certain foregone conclusions are accepted that have not been very closely tested or examined. The term "higher education" has come to be looked upon as the "open sesame," the key to woman's emancipation and advancement—

in fact, the solution of her destiny. As commonly and somewhat vaguely understood, higher education means instruction in the so-called higher branches of learning, the study of Latin and Greek, of the sciences in general or some special course, and finally the training for a profession, or for some of the higher industries or arts.

In our intensely acquisitive age, so bent upon the conquest and possession of things material and physical, it is not surprising that the question is often asked whether men have any use for a liberal education which does not fit them for the practical needs of life and for the struggle which every day grows keener, more selfish and more personal. Setting aside, however, a point of view that condemns advanced education on the ground that it is not materialistic enough, not utilitarian, not special enough to suit the wants of the times, we hear graver objections urged by those well qualified to judge, on the very ground that it is too materialistic, too much given over to the utilities, and too highly specialized to meet the true ends and broad purpose of culture—the unfoldment and best direction of man's highest faculties, the raising of his rank in the moral and social order, and the adjustment of his relations to the great universe around him, the seen and unseen. From infancy the physical senses are trained to a nicety; the child is taught accurately to observe and examine—to note every detail and discover the properties, the structure and "mechanism," of every natural and material object that comes within reach of outward and external sense. But there is a hidden sense as well—the vital principle itself, which may pass unperceived, undetected by the most minute microscopic investigation. The flower is picked to pieces, but the life, the soul, the fragrance, may exhale without recognition. Even the living creature is sacrificed—the frog is dissected, the rabbit, the dog, or the cat taken apart like any machine in order to ascertain the apparatus of its being; but what has been learned of the real secret, the mystery of a breathing, moving, sentient organism adapted to its own ends and environment, and filling its own place in creation? It has been truly said that "if modern knowledge is power, it is not wisdom"; and therefore, with increased education, the social status does not always improve, crime does not diminish, nor suffering grow less, and thus the levels of life are not lifted. And now that woman has taken into her own hands the shaping of her destiny, can she do better than accept these conditions? Can she conceive of no higher ideals, no grander incentive, and no more beautiful fulfilment? What is it that woman aims at in the widening of her career? Is it not freedom—the intellectual mastery and control that have made man free, and that she fondly hopes will give her freedom in turn? How shall she best attain it, she asks.

But right here, in the answer she gives herself, is actually the mistake that she makes, and that perhaps explains in part the hostile attitude of many men and the shrinking of certain women when equal claims and rights are asserted. Precisely by following in man's footsteps, she insists; along the lines he has chosen and with the same objects and ambitions in view. Just what he has accomplished, I will strive to accomplish. Just as he has built, I will build; just as he has aspired, I will aspire. But surely here is no freedom in its true sense, because no deliverance and enlargement of spirit, giving birth to new individuality and initiative. Un-

doubtedly there are women gifted to excel where men have excelled, in scientific and professional pursuits; but these women are necessarily exceptional. There are reasons deep-seated in her own constitution, and in the constitution of society, why it is not easy nor always to be advised that young women should be subjected to the mental strain and strict training required to fit them for a profession, nor is it well or often possible that girls as a rule should leave their homes and be sent into the world like boys. But even under the most favoring circumstances, and when good result has been accomplished without too great sacrifice or injury in any other direction, it is seldom that a woman is able to devote herself without interruption, and to the exclusion of the more intimate interests of life, to the callings that require unremitting and absorbed attention. Marriage comes in as so paramount a factor; an episode in the life of a man, it is a career for a woman, in most cases incompatible with any other career. And for women who do not marry, the claims and duties of home are often quite as pressing and incumbent; the family tie is stronger, the dependence more subtle, and the whole affectional side of life has greater stress and obligation with women than with men. But apart from these practical considerations, no woman who has sounded the depths of her own nature can help feeling that a profound deception awaits those who imagine that the outward extension of privilege, the liberty to enter the arena and compete for what the world prizes, will satisfy the deep inner craving, the vague but keen longing, the unknown want which the world cannot fulfil.

Women even more than men are restless, unsatisfied, seeking they know not what, they know not where; for a great hope has gone out of the world, a great light and presence once seen and felt by all. The world can not and need not go back to its primitive beliefs, but spiritual growth must keep pace with mental growth. In proportion as the realm of matter is explored and brought within the compass of mind the realm of spirit must expand to receive it, filling and making radiant with its presence the whole visible universe. The laws and harmonies of nature reveal still deeper harmony and all-embracing law; spiritual truth that reflects itself in man's inner consciousness in the workings of heart, brain, and soul. The mysteries of growth and evolution suggest untold possibilities, and lay the foundations of life and its finalities in ideal regions far beyond the range of physical sense. The finite loses its grasp and man becomes aware of his relations with the Infinite, of the constant inflowing of divine energies in his own being, and of eternal reality underneath the passing show of appearance. In the light of such understanding knowledge becomes wisdom, and higher education becomes the education of the higher nature. And it is women especially who have the key to this higher knowledge, in their finer perceptions and sensibilities, their more delicate organization so quick to discern the hidden sense of things, the meanings that flash out from the unseen and that are not apprehended by the intellect alone, but by the whole personality, which kindles with sympathetic response. This is the secret of that moral force which gives woman a strength beyond strength, faith beyond joy, and love beyond self. And this is truly woman's "sphere,"—her "vocation," whatever post she may fill,—to live within vision of the ideal, upon a

plane not bounded by the pleasures and pains of sense, and therefore to a certain extent released from the thralldom of material conditions. What higher mission and privilege for woman than to lead the example—to set the fashion, as it were, of nobler, purer, and simpler lives, consecrated to deeper and more unselfish purpose? Who can doubt that social ills would be remedied, and the pressure lifted? We should hear less of lives wasted by luxury and lives wasted by poverty, and civilization would cease to be a machine which threatens to crush out the soul of humanity.

*Josephine Lazarus.*

#### The Artist Maynard.

GEORGE WILLOUGHBY MAYNARD, the painter of "Daphne," the picture engraved for the frontispiece of this number of the magazine, was born at Washington, D. C., March 5, 1843. In 1866 he studied drawing and modeling under Henry K. Brown, and in 1867 became a pupil in the schools of the National Academy of Design at New York, and later studied under the painter Edwin White, with whom he went abroad in 1869. He felt himself especially drawn towards the works of the Dutch masters, and these he studied in Antwerp and other cities. In 1873 Maynard, in company with his friend the well-known artist and writer Francis D. Millet, went on a long journey through Transylvania, over the Carpathians, across Roumania, and down the Danube to the Black Sea and Odessa. From Odessa they went to Constantinople, Smyrna, Athens, and finally to Rome, where Maynard remained through the winter of 1873-74. He returned to New York, after an absence of five years, in the spring of 1874, and exhibited a picture ("The Angelus") for the first time at the National Academy in the spring of 1875. He has exhibited in the Academy every year since. In 1876 he made his first essay in decorative art as an assistant to John La Farge in the work in Trinity Church, Boston, and he has been closely identified with this branch of the fine arts ever since. His work in this field includes the figures on each side of the proscenium in the Metropolitan Opera House—"The Chorus" and "The Ballet"; a large part of the interior decoration of the Ponce de Leon Hotel at St. Augustine, Florida; parts of the entrance hall of the Boston Public Library, etc. Of easel pictures perhaps his most important work is the beautiful composition "Mermaids and Marines," that justly attracted great attention at the Academy exhibition of 1890; a water color called "The Sirens," exhibited in 1889; and genre works entitled "Old and Rare," "Strange Gods," and "The Bride." He has painted a number of portraits, those of William M. Evarts, C. C. Beaman, Chester Chapin, and Judge Addison Brown among the number. He is a member of the Society of American Artists, of the American Water Color Society, and a National Academician. His work is much esteemed by his fellow-artists, who recognize in it a true artistic aim and great ability in its expression; and his position in the social art world is shown by the fact that he is the president of the Salmagundi Club, and a member of the Tile, Players, and Century clubs.

*William A. Coffin.*

## TOPICS OF THE TIME.

### How to Develop American Sentiment among Immigrants.

WHATEVER individual opinion may be on the policy of restricting immigration, or however public sentiment concerning this question may shift, there can be no difference about the desirability and the necessity of making good Americans of those already here or certain to come. That the country still makes demand for strong, healthy men and women is not open to doubt, and it is almost equally clear that the supply must come, now as ever, from the countries of Europe.

It is important, therefore, to consider the conditions that surround the humble people of other lands — “who are seeking to convert obstacle into opportunity, and wrest achievement from difficulty”—who find here their place and their work. They are not criminals, or suspects, or paupers, or anarchists, or socialists, or disorganizers. They have no intention of joining the ranks of the so-called “dangerous classes.” They are simply plain people brought up in the fear of God, and with a desire and a necessity to earn an honest living by their labor.

They learn in due time that here, with universal suffrage, residence means citizenship. They attach themselves to one of our great political parties, moved thereto, as others are, by association, interest, or opinion. They may not know much about the complicated institutions under which they must live; but they are teachable, willing, and anxious to learn. In the case of adults, their schooldays are over; so that they cannot by this means be fused into our life, with its new customs, manners, and ideas. They were born to conditions greatly different from those in the home of their adoption. They come from countries where the distinctions of classes are sharp, and where the requirements of standing armies impose burdens which have no existence here. But it must not be forgotten that while the latter are burdens, they also insure a discipline not to be acquired from our customary modes of life.

Among our foreign-born population there is no characteristic stronger than the desire to become real American citizens. From their earliest days here the majority of them manifest this. In many cases they want to pass as Americans, not as foreigners, and there is less of a desire to associate only with their compatriots than is charged to them. But in all this they are confronted with serious difficulties. Their fortunes must of necessity be cast for a time with their own countrymen, from whom they learn whatever they can of their new environment. They are desirous of becoming active in our politics, not merely as office-seekers or office-holders,—although they furnish their full quota of these,—but as interested persons, anxious to contribute to the proper settlement of great and important questions. It is in this that they need help, as, indeed, do thousands of our native-born citizens.

It is pertinent to inquire what we are doing for these people. How are we training them for their new du-

ties? To whom do we turn them over without so much as a thought? What is the school in which they must learn what they can about our system of government, and who are their teachers? As a rule, being a humble people, they find themselves forced into tenement or crowded residence districts. From the time they declare an intention to become citizens they are courted by politicians. In many cases they get their training from demagogues, who themselves are without any clear or just ideas of our political system. They may make their way into the political clubs or organizations to be found in all large cities. Often their countrymen who have preceded them, many of them with personal ends to serve by the control of votes or the assumption to control them, lead them hither and thither. The man who supposes that any considerable proportion of these hard-working immigrants would, of their own motion, procure illegal naturalizations, or practise other frauds upon the suffrage, does not understand their character and purposes. They are ignorantly led into wrong-doing by reckless schemers.

Without direction many of these people fall into the hands of labor agitators, few of whom are both intelligent and disinterested. Many of them are designing men, some are demagogues, and still more are themselves ignorant of American principles and institutions, crude in their ideas of political economy, and solicitous mostly for the promotion of personal ends. Even these men need instruction, and many of them, if compelled day by day to meet arguments supplied to their now helpless followers by such agencies as those proposed, would soon become ashamed, and themselves become pupils instead of assuming to be teachers or leaders.

The statement is made from time to time that we are admitting great masses of socialists. The number is exaggerated, and more importance is attached to the utterances of these than they deserve. It must be admitted, however, that some of them know just enough to be dangerous. But they are permitted to go among their fellows, to inoculate them with whatever doctrines they choose, and there is nothing to oppose them. Nobody has furnished their hearers with arguments, or taken steps to teach them that in America, where conditions are fairly equal, no necessity exists for the violent agitation of these questions. But train bright young men among these immigrants to know what their duties are, teach them their rights, put at their disposal arguments with which to meet the specious assertions of self-styled and talkative leaders, and the much-vaunted dangers of socialism would disappear.

It is time to inquire what citizen or organization of citizens, with unselfish and patriotic motives, meets these new citizens and carries into their humble homes some knowledge of their new environments, political, industrial, and social. Is there any society, either in the large cities or in the sparsely settled communities where they find homes, which tries to teach them what

the Constitution of the United States is, or the history of the country in which they are to pass their lives? 1

The question must have a negative answer. They are left without the protection and knowledge such persons could give them. As a rule, they are given over to that inexorable law of supply and demand which makes no terms and knows no mercy. There are organizations in almost every city to defend, without cost, humble working men and women from imposition on the part of their employers. These do much good. But is there any reason why the mental needs of these people should not have similar aids? Why should not these men be taught what it really means to be an American citizen? This work is made the more easy because of the tendency of immigrants towards cities. Even this is only a natural drift, because it is there that association and opportunity are to be found; it is there also that the bad elements of humanity abound; it is there that temptations multiply, and it is there that the people subjected to them need help.

But who gives it? In what schools or lecture-rooms do these young men find teachers? There are plenty of charitable institutions, there are almshouses almost without number, and every kind of asylum for the unfortunate. These, however, profess only to alleviate physical suffering or promote bodily comfort. There is no reason why good people in every community should not associate with the purpose of giving aid to the people who need it so much. Few of these future citizens know anything about the elementary principles of our republican system; they know almost nothing of federal, state, or local government, and still less of the distinctions between them. They soon learn something of the language,—the child's power to make known wants,—but their knowledge of its literature is scanty. The most promising among them do not acquire much, the dull little or nothing; but with guidance and instruction, with the helping word and the kindly aid to be given by unselfish men and women, these courageous young persons, already here and certain to be made or marred as American citizens, will learn what they most need. They will find that bad and costly government may come as the result of their want of knowledge, and that they themselves must in the end bear more than their share of burdens, ignorantly or corruptly imposed. They will find that they have it in their power to promote honest politics and good government; that they have obligations as well as rights.

The churches do much, but they need help. These people are poor and ignorant, and are subject to every earthly temptation, so that the churches and the clergy find their task more and more difficult. In order to supplement the work of existing agencies, night schools and lectures, designed primarily for the instruction of foreign-born citizens, might be instituted in every large city in which these elements find a refuge. Young men and women of leisure and cultivation would thus find employment of a kind befitting their character and training, and would in this way be able to make some return to government and society for the benefits they themselves have enjoyed; while the good they would do to aspiring citizens—to the men who

in the future will have in their hands the weal or the woe of their country—would be inestimable. The work to be done has only the slightest reference to the three R's or their infinite variations. These must be left to individual effort and to the schools. What is needed is the teaching of the fundamentals of American life.

As it is, too much is left for the children and grandchildren of foreign-born citizens. There is a notion that our duties begin with them. But as most immigrants are still young men when they come here, the importance of doing something with them and for them, and of doing it at once, ought to be recognized. It is these men who must perform most of the manual labor. They are to vote taxes up or to vote them down, and they ought to be taught how to do either with knowledge. It is quite as important that they should know these as that poor children should be carried into the country in summer, or provided with coals in winter. Every kind of philanthropic work is organized and carried out, while the important one of teaching genuine Americanism to millions of honest though simple-minded people is mainly left to chance. We thank God that no man in a great city need go hungry, while, without pang or question, we consign future citizens to the tender mercies of ignorant, reckless, or corrupt political managers.

Such work can be organized and carried on without asking the public for great sums of money. The movement must have a beginning, and it must be humble. But that it will grow, be appreciated by both pupils and teachers, and increase the intelligence and usefulness of all concerned in it, cannot be questioned. In due time it would develop in other directions. When experiments prove that one class of these new people is willing to accept instruction in its duties as citizens, and that young men and women can be found for giving such instruction, it will not be long before applications would be made for teaching in cooking, and other practical subjects, for the benefit of the women among these immigrants.

The organizers of religious and intellectual movements often forget that there is much unused talent in our cities; that there are thousands of young persons who have been trained in schools and in books, but that, being so trained, they have not been able to find employment for their talents and energies. They are waiting only for invitation and leadership, and there is no channel into which their work might better be turned than that suggested in this paper.

There is a tendency on the part of a good many people to belittle what is termed politics. The reason for this is not difficult of discovery. Many of the methods employed in "practical" politics are bad and disheartening. The men who use them are not agreeable either in person or in perspective. But, next to the bread and butter employment, politics is, to the ordinary citizen, really the most important consideration. The protection of life and property, the imposition of taxes, the relations of the State to individuals and industry, the duties of individuals and industries to the State—the importance of all these cannot be overestimated. It is these things that the foreigner who has come to America to pass the remainder of his life needs to know. The better teachers he has in genuine Americanism the better it will be, not only for him, but for the country, and the sooner he will master enough of

<sup>1</sup> Since this was written we learn of an important movement among a single class of immigrants, of which more anon.

the essentials necessary to enable him to cast a manhood vote in the full and true meaning of that term.

There need be no fear that such efforts will not be welcomed by the persons to be benefited by them. Personal interest, pride, and necessity will unite in drawing to such schools or institutions the best and most promising of these new citizens. Not only is this true, but in due time the most efficient teachers and the most liberal contributors will be found among the beneficiaries themselves. It is a work that must appeal to many intelligent and philanthropic people, and one which, once started, will be carried on by its own momentum.

#### Ballot Reform as an Educator.

ADVOCATES for the extension of the right of suffrage have always claimed for it that it exerts an educating influence. In England, where the ballot has been extended from one class to another by clear and well-defined gradations, the contention is correct; but this process has made necessary the enactment of stringent laws against the abuse of the right thus conferred. They are the growth of necessity. In the gradual but almost indefinite enlargement of the suffrage there was developed a large number of voters who, though they had little interest politically in the result of an election, and less knowledge of the principles upon which it was to be settled, had really a personal interest in disposing of their votes for money or its equivalent.

It is clear that the mere right to vote—nowhere deemed a natural one and everywhere restricted—does not carry with it such sense of responsibility as to fit all men who have it for an intelligent use of it. As interests became more direct and personal, as political issues became more important or more complex, and as bad men and bad methods gained the ascendancy, even the right to vote, by those upon whom it had been conferred, was itself subjected to limitation. It may in truth be said that, while bribery is not confined to the most ignorant of the voting population, the majority of corruptible voters is found among them. This rendered inevitable the adoption of methods which should restrict the power of these men to do harm, and for this the secret ballot has been found an efficient instrument.

But the advantages of the secret ballot, first successfully applied in Australia, are not limited to this view. It is showing itself a most efficient educator; not in the generally accepted sense that the man who has the right to vote will learn, as the result of it and for his own interest, to cast that vote intelligently, but as an active ally of our school system. Under the old methods of voting not only was corruption possible, but ignorant men were led to do the behests of bosses or managers without the expenditure of money. This served such men even more effectually than direct bribery. It cost nothing, and it was effective, for the reason that the man who will vote with such ox-like patience and fidelity can be depended upon with more confidence than the one who is bribed.

In a remarkably short time after the beginning of the agitation the Australian ballot has been adopted in some form in a number of States. Under this system the first necessity was a degree of intelligence on the part of the voter. The law provides for assistance to

illiterate voters; but it is this confession of ignorance that hurts the man who has to make it. He may not be ashamed to be ignorant, but he is ashamed to have it known. That he cannot read or write may not seriously affect his own opinion of himself, so long as the knowledge of it is confined to his own family; but when he must confess it before an election board composed of his neighbors, the reproach becomes a sting. In the same manner the voter next in grade above the illiterate, the man who can barely read and write, does not like to run the risk of losing his vote, and with it the power to help himself or his friends, because he does not know how to prepare his ballot.

As a result of this feeling, a direct consequence of the enactment of these laws, schools have been established in almost every community in those States which have adopted the new system. In these schools or classes voters of the lower degrees of intelligence have assembled themselves, anxious to learn something of the new system. Even political clubs and organizations under the sway of the most insolent bosses have been led by the instinct of self-preservation to adopt the same policy.

Thus, as the first result of this agitation, the spectacle has been witnessed of some real attention to the prime requisites in a voter. Instead of blind acquiescence in the dictates of managers, or the action of nominating conventions, the voter shows his interest in what concerns him and the public most directly in the matter of voting, as well as the one important consideration—his fitness for casting this vote with intelligence and reason. In some of the States of the South negroes of mature years, whom the public schools have never been able to reach, have devoted themselves with energy to the task of learning to read and write. In the North it has not, as a rule, been necessary to carry on the work in such an elementary way. But thousands of electors have found it desirable to get instruction in voting. This has not been limited to partizan tickets or to candidates, but has comprehended those things hitherto neglected, the essentials of intelligent voting. That this instruction has been given by political organizations under the rule of bosses does not argue that these voters, when once instructed, will continue to vote just as such organizations or managers may direct.

As in the matter of bribery, there is no assurance that when a pupil has once learned this lesson he will not also have learned another—that his vote is his own; that, being left alone in the voting booth “with God and his lead-pencil” he can fearlessly vote his own sentiments.

Complaint has long been made that while education is so universal and so costly it has not borne fruit in politics. More and more the influence of the public school has waned, and that of vote manipulators waxed strong. Under the new impulse created by necessity the ballot bids fair to become an efficient ally of the public school. With a secret ballot some may be disfranchised temporarily; in the end its results are sure to be helpful to better politics, as well as to general intelligence and to personal independence.

This phase of the agitation should not be overlooked, and the friends of the reform may well put this forward as an additional argument in those States where the secret ballot has not yet been adopted.

## The Decline of Superannuation.

THE readiness of Vermont to give another term in the United States Senate to a man who had already completed his eightieth year is a striking evidence of what may be styled the decline of superannuation. Justin S. Morrill was born in 1810, and yet, when a legislature was to be chosen in 1890 which would elect a senator, the only question as to its action hinged upon the willingness of this octogenarian to accept a fresh commission from his commonwealth. The fact that Mr. Morrill is the first man in our history to be held eligible to such service when past eighty makes his case especially noteworthy, but in truth it only emphasizes a long-growing tendency, which has wrought nothing short of a revolution in the popular feeling regarding old age.

No fallacy is more firmly fixed in the public mind than that which represents the establishment of our government as the work of old men. The delusion is imbedded in childhood, and is unconsciously cultivated by the text-books used in school. The "fathers of the Republic" are depicted in all the histories with wigs, queues, and other accessories of dress that apparently betoken age, and the pupil naturally concludes that they must have been old when the nation was born. In point of fact, they were an uncommonly young set of men. George Washington, senior in age as well as in authority and influence, was but 43 when the Revolution broke out, and 57 when he became first President; Thomas Jefferson, only 33 when he wrote the Declaration of Independence; Alexander Hamilton, but 32 when he became Secretary of the Treasury; James Madison, only 23 when he was made member of a Virginia committee of safety, and 36 when he was Hamilton's great collaborator in the production of that political classic "The Federalist."

Nor were the leaders in the great enterprise exceptional in this matter of age. Forty names were signed to the Constitution of the United States on the 17th of September, 1787. Leaving out of account four whose birthdays are not given by the books of reference, only five of the remaining thirty-six had reached the age of 60; twenty of the number were less than 45 years old; and twelve were under 40, among the latter being one (Hamilton) of 30, another of 29, a third of 28, and a fourth who lacked some months of 27 when the convention met. The average age of all the members did not quite reach 45 years. The most important committee to which the instrument was referred for final revision consisted of five members, four of whom were between 30 and 36 years of age, the fifth and least prominent being 60.

As the men who framed the Constitution were for the most part not advanced in years, so was its interpretation intrusted to a bench with a strong bent towards youth. John Jay, the first Chief-Justice of the Supreme Court, was but 43, and James Iredell, one of his associates, only 39. Bushrod Washington, appointed by Adams in 1798, was but 36, and William Johnson, an appointee of Jefferson's in 1804, only 32. This last was also the age of Joseph Story when Madison in 1811 made him an associate of Johnson. Nor were such men strangers to the bench when made members of the highest tribunal at these comparatively early ages. Jay had been Chief-Justice of New York

at 31; Iredell, judge of the Superior Court of North Carolina when only 27; and Johnson, judge of the South Carolina Court of Common Pleas at the same age.

Comparatively early ages, we have just said. But the expression is only correct when the matter is regarded from the standpoint of to-day. A hundred years ago youth and old age were terms which meant very different things. When the people of the new nation began considering who should be its chief magistrate, Washington was only 56 years of age, and yet he considered the "advanced season of life" which he had reached a just bar to further employment in the public service. "Unwilling in the evening of a life nearly consumed in public cares to quit a peaceful abode for an ocean of difficulties" — so he wrote when leaving Mount Vernon to take the oath of office in the spring of 1789.

The hardships of the Revolutionary War had, of course, left their mark upon Washington, and doubtless had something to do with making him feel an old man while he was still in his fifties. But he expressed only the common judgment of his contemporaries when, as in another letter written before he became President, he regarded "the increasing infirmities of nature" at his "time of life" as disqualifying a man of his years for activity, or at least justifying him in seeking retirement. In the case of the judiciary, indeed, this opinion had sometimes found expression in law, the constitution of New York, adopted in 1777, having provided that no man could be a judge beyond the age of 60, on the ground of his presumable inability for good work on the bench after that age. The popular attitude regarding age which Washington reflected continued during the following generation. It is true that the reverence for the heroes of the Revolution kept many of them in the public service late in life, but the average age at which men were made representatives, senators, and judges still continued remarkably low. David Stone was elected senator from North Carolina in 1801, while in his thirty-first year; Thomas Worthington from Ohio in 1803, when just past 30; and Henry Clay took his seat from Kentucky in 1806, nearly four months before he had reached the constitutional limit of 30, nobody being sufficiently impressed by his youthfulness to take the trouble of looking up his birthday and his eligibility to a seat.

Lincoln's career furnishes a curious proof of the survival of this feeling, especially in the newer States of the Union, down to the middle of the present century. If Lincoln had lived he would now be only a year the senior of Senator Morrill, and yet more than forty years ago he wrote himself down as already an old man. His partner, William H. Herndon, had sent him a letter in 1848, while he was a member of Congress, complaining that the old men in their county were unwilling to let the young ones have any opportunity to distinguish themselves. In his reply Lincoln referred to the subject of the letter as exceedingly painful, declared his conviction that there was some mistake in this impression as to the motives of the old men, and then said:

I suppose I am now one of the old men, and I declare on my veracity, which I think is good with you, that nothing could afford me more satisfaction than to learn that you and others of my young friends at home were doing

battle in the contest, and endearing themselves to the people and taking a stand far above any I have ever been able to reach in their admiration. I cannot conceive that other old men feel differently. Of course I cannot demonstrate what I say; but I was young once, and I am sure I was never ungenerously thrust back.

There is abundant evidence that Lincoln only expressed the popular impression in thus placing himself among "the old men" of Illinois when he was but 39 years of age. It is matter of record that when Ninian Edwards was a candidate for governor of that State in 1826, being then only 51 years old, he considered it necessary to answer a charge that he was too old for the place, and to urge, in extenuation of his admitted lack of youth, that there are some old things, like old whisky, old bacon, and old friends, which are not without their merits.

Contrast with such a state of popular feeling the situation at the present day. More than half of the constitutional convention of 1787 were men who had not reached the age of 45, while there are only seven men who are not past 45 among the eighty-eight members of the United States Senate to-day, and four of these come from the younger States of the West, where there are fewer old men than in the East, Maine and Vermont having, according to the census returns of age, more than six times as many males past the age of 60 proportionally as Colorado and the Dakotas. No less than thirty-seven of the eighty-eight Senators, or nearly half of all, are past 60, and nine of them beyond 70, as three others will be within a few months. Mr. Morrill has a colleague from Ohio who, like him, was born in 1810; two who were born in 1816, and three in 1818. Three of these have, like him, sought and obtained reelections after they were past 70: The average age of all the Senators falls only about a year short of 60. In the Supreme Court the change has been equally remarkable. Since Pierce's day but one man has been placed upon this bench who had not passed the age of 45, while of the twelve appointees during the past two decades no less than four were more than 60 when they took their seats. Of the eight judges left after Mr. Miller's death one is 70 years old, one is 74, and one is 77.

These changes imply and represent a change in public sentiment regarding what constitutes old age which is, as has been said, nothing less than revolutionary. The man of 39 who should to-day speak of himself as an old man would be laughed at. A few months ago a college presidency was offered to a man of 42, and he was universally described by the press as "a young man," "a man in his early prime." Victor Hugo's dictum that "40 is the old age of youth" is already losing its point; and his companion assertion that "50 is the youth of old age" is also becoming an anachronism. When one is accounted still young after he has turned 40 it seems absurd to begin calling him old at 50, nor need he be superannuated at 70. The example of the senior justices on the Supreme bench is most significant in this respect. The law authorizes a member of this court who has served 10 years to retire upon a full pay pension when he reaches 70, but for several years Justices Bradley and Field have declined to avail themselves of this privilege, as did the late Justice Miller during the last four years of his life. They have felt the capacity to do their work, and they preferred work to idleness for the same pay. And the

country has been disposed to commend their decision. People can see no good reason why a judge whose store of knowledge and experience was never before so large should be laid upon the shelf arbitrarily when he reaches a certain age, as Chancellor Kent in 1823 was forced from the bench by the New York constitution because he was 60, although possessed of such physical and mental vigor that he afterwards produced his still famous "Commentaries on American Law." Having removed the temptation of senility to cling to office simply for its needed salary, to which the judges of State courts where there were no judicial pensions have sometimes yielded, the nation enjoys seeing its highest bench adorned by veterans whose fitness for service keeps pace with their years.

The fundamental cause of this change is a physical one—the fact that the average length of human life has been much extended during the past century. True of all highly civilized lands, this is particularly true of a young country like ours. The pioneer period in any community must necessarily be hard and wearing, consuming vitality fast and hastening unduly the approach of old age. A man who has undergone such an experience may easily bear enough traces of it to be accounted old at 50, while another man of a constitution naturally no more robust may find people hardly associating the idea of age with him at 60 or 65. Wider knowledge of the laws of health, better methods of living, have added many years to the period of normal activity, and pushed forward by as many years the time of necessary retirement.

Along with the physical change which defers the oncoming of old age there has been a mental change in the popular estimation of old age when it has arrived. The savage's contempt for this period of life has yielded under modern civilization to a growing respect. Men are less disposed than they once were to thrust aside as out of date those who have come down from a former generation. There is greater recognition than formerly of the value of experience, and the ripened wisdom borne by well-spent years is more highly prized. The change may be observed in every other sphere of life, no less than on the Supreme bench of the nation. It is a change every way to be commended, in the interest of society as well as of the individual. Enforced retirement while one is yet capable of good work has embittered the closing years of a host of active-minded men, and lost the community much excellent service; the decline of superannuation is therefore a most healthy sign of the times.

#### A Service to American Literature.

THE publication of the last of the eleven volumes of the "Library of American Literature from the Earliest Settlement to the Present Time" is an event which should be noted not merely by the literary world in its narrow and professional sense, but by all who read books and are interested in the intellectual progress of the country. Many among those who have followed the volumes as they have successively appeared, now that the very last has been issued, in which the "Library" is fully analyzed, indexed, revised, and supplemented by its editors<sup>1</sup>—many, we say, must now

<sup>1</sup> A valuable addition to the final volume is a series of biographies of all the authors represented, prepared by Mr. Stedman's son, Mr. Arthur Stedman.

feel that they had not fully appreciated the labor and intelligence involved in the undertaking, even if they had already been struck by the range, catholicity, and typical value of the selections. The editors do not make too high a claim when they say that in progressing with the "Library" they realized, after awhile, that they had builded better than they knew; that their "National Gallery" was presenting a rare conspectus of American life—yes, of American history, in all departments of imagination, action, and opinion."

The work that the editors have here performed is unprecedented in its field, and one the like of which will probably not be seen again in our day. Such copyrights as have been placed at their disposal have never been surrendered with such liberality to a literary enterprise of similar nature, the authors and publishers represented doubtless feeling an unusual interest in a series of selections prepared by such highly competent hands.

In surveying this record of American literature, with its gallery of engraved portraits, it has been a great pleasure to us to remark—at a time when we have been celebrating THE CENTURY MAGAZINE'S twentieth anniversary—that this periodical has been so closely connected with the remarkable development of our native literature during the past two decades. The readers of the Stedman-Hutchinson Library will find therein specimens of the literature as well as the "counterfeit presentments" of many men and women who have won public recognition in the pages of THE CENTURY. We are sorry to say that owing to editorial modesty they will miss examples of the fine and rare poetic genius of the junior editor of the "Library," as well as of the vigorous and illuminating prose and the clear, high, and accomplished verse of Mr. Stedman, one of THE CENTURY'S first and foremost contributors. The consolation for the loss of such extracts is in the knowledge that unusual and original talents have gone to the editing of the "Library"—and, as to that matter, any subscriber thereto can easily supplement in the directions named the present full and otherwise thoroughly representative collection.

Mr. Stedman and Miss Hutchinson have done American literature, American history, and American patriotism a great and lasting service.

#### New York as a Historic Town.

In the city of New York, as in the other great cities of the world, a large proportion of the population consists of men who have come to it late in life mainly because it is the metropolis of the country. Not having been born here, not being bound to the city by the ties of youthful acquaintance, these new-comers are often lacking not only in a proper civic pride, but even in a fair knowledge of the history of the town wherein they have chosen to dwell. They do not understand the forces which have been at work in the past to make the community what it is in the present. In New York, for instance, they do not know why the marble City Hall has a brown-stone back—that monument to the short-sightedness of its builders, who did not believe that the town would ever spread farther up the island. They are often alarmed by symptoms which seem to them strange and new, unaware that some of these things are not newly portentous since they have ex-

isted almost unchanged from the days when New York was New Amsterdam.

To set forth the story of the city of New York, of its founding and of its growth, of its struggles and of its success; to do this with a knowledge of the details of the past, and with an appreciation of the difficulties of the present; to tell the tale briefly, briskly, vividly—this is not only to write a good book, it is to do a good deed. And this is what Mr. Theodore Roosevelt has done in the volume he has just written for the series of "Historic Towns," edited by Professor Freeman.

For writing a history of New York City Mr. Roosevelt is exceptionally well qualified. A native New Yorker of the old Dutch stock, he has taken part in the public life of the city ever since he arrived at man's estate, and he has done yeoman service for the cause of good government. He has had a personal acquaintance with the practical part of politics, likely to be as useful to a historian as Gibbon declared that his brief service in the militia had been to him when he came to describe the evolutions of the Roman legionaries. Mr. Roosevelt's earlier literary labors have also stood him in good stead. His "Naval History of the War of 1812" helped him to understand the mercantile development of New York; his biography of "Gouverneur Morris" made him an authority on noted New Yorkers of the Revolution; and his "Winning of the West" gave him a sympathy with the pioneer, the settler, and the wandering trader, more akin in condition and not unlike in character to those who founded New York, and by whose efforts it gained its first growth.

Mr. Roosevelt is a master of vigorous narrative, with the faculty of telling a tale briskly, and of setting a figure before us firm on its feet. After reading his pages we know Peter Stuyvesant better, and Jacob Leisler; we understand George Clinton and Aaron Burr, as we see them presented amid the conditions which cause them and which they helped to create; and more recently we recognize in the etched outlines of the shabby figures of Fernando Wood and of William M. Tweed the result of conditions still existing and of causes still in operation.

For us who now see in New York a French quarter and an Italian quarter, a Chinese quarter and a negro quarter, and who know how small a part of the whole these four quarters are, it is well to be reminded that even when grim old Peter Stuyvesant ruled the city the population was very mixed—the Dutch being most numerous, then the English (from New England and from old England alike), then the French Huguenots, and the Walloons and Germans, and men of so many other stocks that sixteen languages and dialects were spoken on this island of Manhattan. At the head of affairs were good men and true; but deep down below there was danger then as now. Mr. Roosevelt tells us that imported bond-servants escaped to New York from New England and Virginia and found congenial associates from half the countries of Europe, "while even beneath their squalid ranks lay the herd of brutalized black slaves. It may be questioned whether seventeenth-century New Amsterdam did not include quite as large a proportion of undesirable inhabitants as nineteenth-century New York."

Even in the early days the lines of political cleavage were determined rather by caste than by race: social distinctions were more potent than differences of speech.



Perhaps this was due in part to the fact that no nationality was put at a disadvantage. It is now more than two hundred years since New York, "in line with that policy of extreme liberality toward all foreign-born citizens" which it has always followed, "conferred full rights of citizenship upon all white foreigners who should take the oath of allegiance." This special act was to benefit the Huguenots, then being expelled from France by tens of thousands; and the accession of a Dutch king to the English throne was yet another force working in favor of the fusion of races in this city—a fusion which "follows but does not precede," so Mr. Roosevelt tells us, "their adoption of a common tongue." To those who look with fear at the enormous influx of foreigners of late years it is encouraging to be told, as Mr. Roosevelt in effect tells us more than once, that probably there has been no time when those whose parents were born in New York have formed a majority of the population, and certainly there has been no time when the bulk of the citizens were of English blood. In public life the two chief men of the city in the last century were of non-English stock—Hamilton of Scotch and Creole descent, and Jay of Huguenot and Holland. So in this century the men most prominent in affairs were Astor, a German, and Vanderbilt, a Dutchman.

Despite this admixture, there has been no lack of patriotism here, no unwillingness to take the initiative. It was New York that called the first council of the colonies in 1690, it was in New York that the Stamp Act Congress met in 1765, and it was in New York that the first blood of the Revolution was spilt—for the Liberty Pole fight of 1770 took place six weeks before the Boston Massacre. It was New York that issued the call for the Continental Congress; it was in New York that "The Federalist" was published; and when trouble came again at last under the rule of the Constitution which "The Federalist" had explained and made possible, it was a New York regiment of militia which was one of the first to reach Washington.

Peace hath more victories than war, and of these quieter triumphs New York has had her share. Many men had sought to propel boats by steam; it was a citizen of New York who showed the way. Many men had tried to send messages by electricity; it was a citizen of New York who devised the best means to this end. And later the city of Fulton and of Morse was chosen for his home by Ericsson, the inventor of the screw steamship, who here added during a long life to the list of his important inventions, including the *Monitor*. In 1820, when Sydney Smith asked "Who reads an American book?" there had been written here but two books which any American need read now; these are "The Federalist" and "Knickerbocker's History of New York"—and both were written in New York. Irving was the first American author to be accepted in England, and another New Yorker, who soon followed him into literature, James Fenimore Cooper, was the first American author to be accepted throughout Europe.

It is well to be reminded of these things. A pride in the past helps us to take heart for the work of the present. The condition of the city is improving in many ways. There is, for instance, no ruffian in public life to-day as brutal as Isaiah Rynders; there are

fewer riots, and these are sooner controlled; and it is not in New York now that the successor of Bill Poole would be honored with a public funeral. Notwithstanding some grievous set-backs, the city is slowly and surely advancing, though still scandalously behind many other large cities of the world in the art of self-government.

#### Protection for the Red Cross.

THE objects of the Red Cross International Association are not so well understood in this country as its merits warrant. The popular knowledge extends but little further than an understanding that the Red Cross is the badge of a humane institution which does relief work in war abroad and in calamities at home, such as the Johnstown disaster and the Mississippi floods. In reality the society is a far-reaching organization, ramifying through all the civilized nations of the world, except perhaps two or three, banding them together in the effort to make war less horrible and sudden calamities less disastrous. It originated in Switzerland, and its emblem, for the protection of which in this country a bill is now before Congress, is the flag of the Alpine republic with the colors reversed. The organization took the name of the symbol, and both became known as the universal sign of war relief among the armies of the civilized world. By the terms of the Geneva treaty, under the regulations of which the society has been internationally organized, there is now no other military hospital flag, and all hospital supplies, all attendants at a field or military hospital, must bear it as a sign of neutrality. It renders sacred from molestation every person or thing wearing or bearing it. It relates to the preservation of life on the greatest scale, and in the direst necessities known to mankind. Can any sign be higher or more sacred? Can mankind afford that it be trifled with by the mercenary and unscrupulous?

Yet this is what is being done, not only in our country but in all others, for everywhere governments are finding it necessary to protect from the spirit of commercialism a symbol sacred to the cause of humanity, in order that its fair fame may not be used, as it is being used, to advance the sale of cigars, washboards, whisky, and medicines. Under its protection serious frauds have been perpetrated. When the hearts of the people have been stirred by the knowledge of some great calamity, irresponsible persons have set up a so-called Red Cross Agency and have collected moneys for their own use, of which the true Red Cross has never had a cent. Such tricks defraud the people at a time when their generosity is not only most open-handed but most needed.

The organization was originally designed for service in war, but by a clause inserted in its constitution by Miss Barton, president of the American Red Cross Association, its forces have been brought to bear in times of elemental as well as human warfare. This provision has become known abroad as the "American amendment," and has been officially adopted by the other nations who are parties to the treaty.

The work which has fallen to the American association in the last eight years makes a somewhat startling record. The Red Cross has done what it found to do on twelve fields of national disasters, including one

fire, four floods, three cyclones, one epidemic, one famine, one earthquake, and one pestilence. It has attended two international conferences abroad as representative of the United States Government, and it is most noteworthy that it has neither received nor asked aid in any form from the government, not even the cost of arranging the treaty.

What it now asks in justice to the people, as well as for our credit with other nations, is official protection for the name and insignia adopted by the treaty, to the extent of making a false use of either a penal offense, punishable by fine, or imprisonment, or confiscation of the goods on which it appears. Within the last eighteen months a successful effort has been made to do this in nearly all other countries, each nation having found abundant proof of the necessity for this step within its own borders.<sup>1</sup> The resolutions of recent

international conferences, the official action of other governments, and the direction of the committee of Geneva, have rendered it incumbent on the American association to take similar action.

The bill also seeks to incorporate the National association under the charter of the United States, since international regulation requires that there should be one national organization, and one alone, in each country, through which the Geneva committee may communicate with each government. The bill asks less rather than more power than that already possessed by the present association. The insignia and the institution belong to the government, and not to any society whatsoever, and the bill only proposes that the government through its officers shall take care of its own and prevent the unwarrantable intrusion of mercenary enterprises.

## OPEN LETTERS.

### A World-Literature.

THE other day I happened to drop into a small book-store here in Europe, and to my great surprise found there some numbers of THE CENTURY. Among others was that for April, 1890, in which I discovered the article on "World-Literature" as a basis of literary training. The article seemed to me so well said and so opportune withal, that I at once felt impelled to write you of my pleasure in reading it.

It is a very noticeable fact that the science of philology, great as have been its advances in this century, has less and less made itself felt upon literature. In the United States there is not, I believe, a single powerful writer who knows anything about philology—or, to put it better, there is not a single philologist who is a powerful writer. And this is the case the world over. One can think of men who have become intellectual forces in the modern world because of their knowledge of biology, of chemistry, of history, of political economy, of philosophy; but of no one (with the apparent exception of Renan) who has become so by his knowledge of philology. Indeed, it is a curious fact that modern philology, which now rejects as unscientific everything savoring of the belles-lettres, owes its own original impulse to literature, and not to its own inherent force. Thus the founder of Romance philology, Diez, was a devotee of Byron, and did his first literary work as a translator of Byron's verse. Thus the founders of Germanic philology were in the first place men under the influence of Goethe and his friends, and in the second place the Romanticists. To these men, laboring primarily because of a literary impulse, we really owe the foundation of modern philology. But now this same philology affects to cast off literature, and one finds at every turn invectives against what the German philologists love to call the *Belletristen*. Every day, that is, philology becomes more and more separated from literature—that is, from

life. It has already ceased to have any real influence upon the opinions of mankind.

We cannot hope, then, that philology will give us in education material for the formation of writers. It has now fallen into the hands of men who have ends of their own, apart from the intellectual needs or desires of the world at large. They criticize according to their own standards, and he who ventures to work apart from those standards finds himself overwhelmed with ridicule and abuse. There is no way, then, but to cut loose from them, leave them to follow their own course, and for one's own part simply to use what of their results has practical value.

But whither shall we turn for that new conception of knowledge, that new adaptation of science to life, to the needs of men in general, which may fairly be expected to yield some fruit in practice? It seems to me that this article indicates with precision the direction we have to take. The first necessity is return to life, which philology has abandoned. To return to life is to turn to literature as the expression of life, to search in literature for the conceptions which have proved themselves really vital, and to study the expression given to these conceptions, wherever they have assumed final and adequate form. It is to follow in peoples the growth of perceptions needing expression, and to endeavor to make out that *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, which in life, in literature, in religion, constitutes the catholic faith. It is to study that parallelism which Wordsworth remarked between true literature and life, that mysterious power that the forms of art possess of working in harmony with the eternal forces of the universe, so that, apparently, men cannot help adopting as their own, in the long run, all that is both founded on fact and adequately expressed in literature. In short, it is to study literary expression, intellectual impulses, artistic and spiritual movements, as all having fundamental laws, intelligible to man if only they can be properly set forth.

MADRID, SPAIN.

M.

<sup>1</sup> The Emperor of Japan and the King of Belgium have accepted the active presidencies of national associations, in order

to uphold the organization with all the authority of their respective governments.

I WISH to call Mr. Higginson's attention to a course of study given in 1888 and 1889 at the University of Michigan by Mr. C. M. Gayley, then assistant professor of English. It was designated in the calendar as a course in literary criticism, and, with Aristotle's Poetics as a basis, dealt with the laws of the great divisions of literature, and with the application of these laws to the great examples of epic, tragedy, etc., in all times and in all languages.

The class met twice a week, once for an hour's lecture on the philosophical basis of literary criticism, and again for a two-hour session, one-half of which was occupied by essays, and the other half by general discussions on the points brought out in the essays and additional points presented by members of the class. The heavier subjects usually required two evenings, sometimes more—one for the discussion of laws, and one or more for their application. On one of these latter evenings Mr. Higginson might have seen his idea of a collegiate course of study in a world-literature approximately realized. Certain particular examples were always assigned, but the work was by no means confined to these, as the course was given for advanced students who had read widely. Although a good proportion of the class was familiar with the masterpieces of literature in their original settings, the course, being literary and not philological, was

open to those who knew them chiefly through translations.

As will be seen, these are the broadest of outlines. Other topics, such as the lyric and the novel, were considered, and throughout there was no lack of minute dividing and subdividing, of building of theories, of hotly contested argument; and in a class of twenty or thereabouts the illustrations were perhaps only too apt to range from Dan to Beersheba.

*Isabella M. Andrews.*

#### Who was the First Woman Graduate?

IN an article on "The First Female College" (the Georgia Female College), in THE CENTURY for May, 1890, Mr. H. S. Edwards states that he has been unable to obtain the name of any woman who graduated at Oberlin in 1838. Correspondents inform us, however, that the information may be found in the Oberlin College triennial catalogue, which gives the name of Miss Zeruiah Porter (afterwards Mrs. Weed) as the graduate of 1838, and therefore the first graduate of an American female college. Miss Porter graduated in the so-called literary course, which did not include Greek. In 1841 Miss Mary Hosford, Miss Elizabeth S. Prall, and Miss Mary C. Rudd took the full classical degree of A. B. at Oberlin.

## BRIC-À-BRAC.

### The Jay-bird's Friday.

(There is a superstition among the old negroes of the South that the jay-birds are pledged to carry wood to his Satanic Majesty every Friday, and that they never fail to fulfil the obligation.)

DE sun he look out froug de wood,  
 All on Friday mornin',  
 Den he kiver up he face wid er big gray hood,  
 All on Friday mornin';  
 De lark she riz up f'om de dew,  
 All on Friday mornin',  
 But de jay-bird he got work ter do,  
 All on Friday mornin':  
 Don' you hear dat blue jay call,  
 Don' you hear de dead sticks fall?—  
 He totin' down firewood fur we all,  
 All on Friday mornin'.

De sap-sucker work wid he ax an' pick,  
 All on Friday mornin',  
 But oh! dat jay-bird make me sick,  
 All on Friday mornin';  
 De mawkin'-bird don' sing so sweet,  
 All on Friday mornin',  
 An' dey hain't no shuffle in dese ole feet,  
 All on Friday mornin':  
 Don' you hear dat blue jay call,  
 Don' you hear de dead sticks fall?—  
 He totin' down firewood fur we all,  
 All on Friday mornin'.

De pattridge call, but I hain't gwine come,  
 All on Friday mornin',  
 An' de bull-frog know he kin beat he drum,  
 All on Friday mornin'.  
 Oh! de jay-bird he play all de week,  
 Twel come Friday mornin',  
 Den he work lack er worfless, lazy sneak,  
 All on Friday mornin':  
 Don' you hear dat blue jay call,

Don' you hear de dead sticks fall?—  
 He totin' down firewood fur we all,  
 All on Friday mornin'.

He kerhootin' wid de debil es shore 's you born,  
 All on Friday mornin',  
 Fur he selled hisse'f fur er year er corn,  
 On er Friday mornin';  
 He work lack he s'archin' fur er bag er gole,  
 All on Friday mornin',  
 But he totin' down wood ter de debil's hole,  
 All on Friday mornin'.  
 Don' you hear dat blue jay call,  
 Don' you hear de dead sticks fall?—  
 He totin' down firewood fur we all,  
 All on Friday mornin'.

Um! dat fire gwine be mighty hot,  
 Come some Friday mornin'.  
 And de debil put de sinners in one big pot,  
 Come some Friday mornin'.  
 Den he laugh w'en she full, an' den he gwine grin,  
 All on Friday mornin',  
 Fur he gwine jes drap dat blue jay in,  
 All on Friday mornin'.  
 Don' you hear dat blue jay call,  
 Don' you hear de dead sticks fall?—  
 He totin' down firewood fur we all,  
 All on Friday mornin'.

Don' you hear dat jay-bird?—Dar!  
 Dis an Friday mornin'.  
 Oh! hit jes kinder creep up froug de ha'r,  
 All on Friday mornin'.  
 W'en he hear de jay-bird call,  
 W'en he hear de dead sticks fall,  
 Hit make de darky solemn, hit make 'im mighty  
 small,  
 Ever' Friday mornin'.

*Virginia Frazer Boyle.*

## TOPICS OF THE TIME.

### One Means of Regulating the Lobby.

THE people of Massachusetts, always in the van of political progress, are earnestly seeking to solve a new and important problem. They want to abolish or regulate the lobby, an institution which, during the past twenty-five years, has fastened itself upon every legislature in the United States. Is there a necessity for such an institution? So many men of little knowledge have, under the operation of our system, found their way into legislative assemblies, and the number and seriousness of questions to be settled has increased so much, that it was perhaps only natural that a third body, having no official relations with a legislature, should arise in order to supply some of the deficiencies.

So few legislators had knowledge of public questions that some method of instruction was almost indispensable. It was inevitable that interested persons, corporations, or municipalities would employ men for the purpose of affording this instruction. As a rule, this work is done by men of intelligence,—specialists in the questions with which they deal,—and they are employed for this reason. Most of their work is persuasive in its nature. They not only give information to men who lack or wish it, but they are instructors in social amenities, in which the legislator is sometimes seriously lacking. Dinner entertainments, social courtesies, are a good part of their stock in trade. Corruption is not a necessity with the lobbyist, though he sometimes makes use of that. In spite of a widespread impression to the contrary, only a small proportion of legislators are open to corrupt approaches; but nearly all can be influenced, as most men can be, by persuasion, courteous treatment, or social attentions to themselves or their families. No man knows human nature better than the lobbyist; if he does not, he has mistaken his calling. The professional lobbyist also is well acquainted with those influences (or "pulls") emanating from a legislator's constituency, or political or social backing, through which he can be most easily reached.

The lobby is almost inseparable from the present committee system, which during the past forty years has come to dominate legislative bodies. Nearly all its relations are with committees. It has an influence in the appointment of committees, and begins operations as soon as they are organized. It formulates bills, has them introduced, in many cases referred, as it may dictate. Its real work consists in getting a favorable report at just the right time on its pet measures. In most cases this is easy, because of the fact that the legislative committee is a secret body, not responsible to the public for its action. Nobody reports its proceedings. Its hearings are seldom public, and yet the lobby has free access to it. It knows its incomings and outgoings. It knows the weak points of the strong members, and gradually enmeshes the weaker ones until their actions can be molded to its purposes.

The composition of modern legislatures has made this comparatively easy. In former times enough

strong, virile men got into them to control them. The member ignorant of affairs, or the weak man, wherever he came from, was compelled by public sentiment to defer more or less to his leaders. Until the caucus became all-powerful, the strong man in a legislative body had far more influence than now. Business was then transacted on the floor, not in a caucus where a little more than a fourth of a legislative body often dictates its action. Then, too, the committee system has made men specialists in legislation, so that the experienced members—those who have seen two or three terms of service, and learned the ins and outs of what may be termed their art—are able to control the newer members, and, at the same time, when they have corrupt or selfish purposes, to promote bad legislation, most of it of a private character. In this era of bosses and caucuses nearly every member of a legislature has incurred obligations to some man or corporation contributing either votes or money to his election.

There is more and more need that legislatures should be held to the closest responsibility in small things as well as in large. The newspapers do this fitfully. When legislation has reached the point that a sensation can be made out of an exposure, then the newspaper is of great use as a regulator. But connected with this valuable means of regulation is much that is mere idle gossip, much that is based upon personal bias, and still more that is trifling, so that, while the present system is in vogue, it is not safe to put sole trust in the press as an agency for protecting the public from legislative imposition. Until committee reports are made, the newspaper gets scarcely any news of the work of committees. In most cases it is then too late to stop bad legislation, or to render harmless the work of the lobby. If the measure is open to suspicion, or the legislative body more than ordinarily amenable to bad influences, the mischief is done before the public knows anything about it; and the people's sole dependence is upon the veto of a president or a governor. In some cases this is effective; but in many States the veto power of the governor is less than nothing, for the reason that the same majority that passed the bill originally may pass it again, in spite of executive objection. It is also true that too much dependence is thus placed upon one man, and that in such a way as to excite popular opposition to this method. In this way bad laws are enacted, and selfish interests triumph. The lobby takes its pay, the promoters get their profit, and political committees, bosses, or candidates are allotted their share of the plunder in order the more effectually to corrupt the suffrage and make still worse legislation possible in the future.

Nothing but an aroused public sentiment can reach the bargains made by candidates for speaker, or for political management, under which committee appointments are bartered for votes. A simple device—though it may not be the only one necessary—for correcting lobby abuses is *publicity in the proceedings of committees*. Let arguments be heard on every bill that comes

before a committee, with full notice to all concerned—opponents as well as friends. These should be open to the public, and there the merits of every measure would be thoroughly debated before report had been made upon it. This would enable the committees to get the very best knowledge obtainable on every question. It would take away from the lobby its dark-lantern character, and from the committee its star-chamber element. It would throw the light upon every measure. In due time the newspapers would make it plain that, while the proceedings of a legislature are important, the proceedings of its committees are still more so. The system would bring before these committees men interested in legislation, and, as a rule, the interests involved would employ only the most intelligent to be found. Such a process would inform not only the public but legislators themselves. After these arguments had been heard the chances for bad motives to assert themselves would be greatly diminished. Committees would hear both sides and then decide. Now they often hear one side only, and that many times in an unintelligible if not a corrupt way.

When this has been adopted as a policy let nobody be admitted to the floor of legislative halls other than members and officers, with such occasional guests as should be so honored. Thus the character of legislative promoters would be changed. It would largely fall into the hands of men of ability and character, because the arguments of no others would be likely to affect legislation favorably. It is clear that with a free ballot—that is, a secret ballot, the universal adoption of which seems to be assured—and open legislative action the public interests would be conserved. It cannot be expected that bad measures would entirely disappear, but nothing is more certain than that they would decline in number and become less and less dangerous. Legislators and governors would have the information to which they are entitled, and the public an opportunity to know what is going on. It ought thus to be able at all times to protect its own interests, as it would have no excuse for ignorance, while legislators would be protected from unnatural and dangerous impunity, and their reputation improved.

#### The Salary Problem.

"THE scholar in politics" is hard enough to get at best, and it is exasperating to run the risk of losing him because he "cannot afford it." This is what we have narrowly escaped in the case of a West Virginian, who was professor in a Washington college and president of the university of his State before he was elected to Congress in 1882, and who has made a most excellent record as a Representative at Washington. He is now serving his fourth term, and has gained that experience in legislative methods which must supplement ability before the most talented man can do his best in the Capitol. Yet a few months ago he threatened to end his career in public life, declaring that, in justice to the interests of his family, he must retire from Congress and earn more money, as he could easily do in his profession as a lawyer. Happily he was prevailed upon to change his mind and accept a reelection.

Mr. Wilson's case is not exceptional. Every Congress sees the withdrawal of more than one man who is admirably equipped for the public service, and who

heartily enjoys its opportunities for usefulness, simply because he is poor and cannot support his family upon the salary. Nor is it a rare event to find a judge of a Federal court surrendering his life commission because the pay is not large enough to relieve him from constant pecuniary worry. Moreover, such cases do not begin to tell the whole story. Not only do many men make the trial of living upon the salary of a congressman or a judge and give it up as "a bad job," but many more decline to be considered candidates for such offices because they know well enough without trying how the experiment would work. Much the same thing is as true of the States as of the nation. A judgeship of the Massachusetts Supreme Court recently fell vacant, and a Boston paper told what every reader knew to be the simple truth, that a number of the State's ablest lawyers were outside the range of choice because of the smallness of the salary as compared with what they earn at the bar.

The case is too plain for argument. The highest salary paid a judge of the United States District Court is \$5000 a year, and four-fifths of the number receive only \$3500; Circuit judges are allowed \$6000 a year, but must pay out of it the expenses of traveling over the several States included in each circuit; Supreme Court judges receive \$10,000, but they also have to defray the expenses of some work on circuit. Senators and Representatives receive \$5000, with an allowance for traveling expenses. The judges, with a very few exceptions among the District judges in agricultural States, live in cities, including, of course, all the largest cities in the country. Congressmen must spend in Washington more than three months during the short session of Congress, and seven or eight months, at least, during the long session, with a chance of not getting away until the tenth or the eleventh month.

Consider the situation of a District judge in one of our larger cities who has a family of four or five children at those ages when the expenses connected with their education are most heavy; reflect that, however modest his tastes, he must live in a style not unworthy of his high office; and show, if you can, how he may "make both ends meet" on a salary of \$3500 or \$4000 a year. Or take the case of a congressman with like family, who has no private fortune, who is conscientious in the discharge of his duties, and who consequently has little time or strength left for making additions to his official income, even if he has the opportunity. He has his home in the city or town of his residence, which of course he wishes to retain. But he also desires to enjoy home life in Washington, and to rent a house at the capital, where he may have with him during the sessions his wife and such of their children as need not be away at school or college. "Never separate yourself from your family while you are a member of Congress," was the advice which Nathaniel P. Banks says that Edward Everett gave him when he first went to Washington as a Representative. It was good advice for the congressman of a generation ago, and it is equally wise counsel for the congressman of to-day. But no congressman of to-day can follow it unless he has a private fortune. To talk about doing it on \$5000 a year is simply a waste of words. "I live here," once said a New England Senator of inexpensive tastes, who had long maintained a modest home in Washington, "as economically as I know how,—certainly not so well as I do at my quiet home in a New England town,—

and yet my salary will not pay my expenses." This was nearly twenty years ago, and the cost of such an establishment must have increased fully fifty per cent., at the lowest estimate, during the interval, while the salary of the Senator is not larger now than then. The fact is that no Senator or Representative who is dependent upon his salary ever thinks of "keeping house" in Washington. He boards, often without the company of his wife and children. Another New England Senator has recently confessed that during twenty years' service at one end or the other of the Capitol he has never been able to hire a house, and that his wife and he have "experienced the varying fortune of Washington boarding-houses, sometimes very comfortable, and a good deal of the time living in a fashion to which no Pittsburg mechanic earning two dollars a day would subject his household."

There is absolutely nothing to be said in defense of such a system. The only excuse which could ever be made for parsimony would be necessity. A poor people, but recently emerged from a long war and still suffering from all sorts of financial complications, might properly have fixed a low scale of compensation for the officials of the new Government, although the scale adopted a hundred years ago was really much higher than the present system, allowing for the great difference in the purchasing power of money and the large increase in the cost of living. It has, indeed, often been urged that public officials should be paid only small salaries in order that they may set an example of frugality. Oddly enough, this argument is oftenest advanced by those officials who are not dependent upon their salaries. The New England Senator whose private fortune enabled him to maintain a home in Washington as well as in his State opposed an increase of congressional salaries when the question was last agitated, seventeen years ago, holding that "we ought to set an example of frugality at the capital of our country." But one cannot help wondering if he would have been so enamored of a "frugal" salary if lack of private means had forced him and his wife to experience "the varying fortune of Washington boarding-houses," and to live a good deal of the time "in a fashion to which no Pittsburg mechanic earning two dollars a day would subject his household." An Ohio demagogue who resorted to the "frugality" plea, in a debate on this subject in the House of 1873, was very neatly cornered by an inquisitive colleague. "We get enough now," he said, "for economical living, enough for plain, comfortable living, if we will only be satisfied with it. We should rather return to the old-fashioned, solid, plain, substantial habits of our fathers." Here he was interrupted with the question if he did not himself pay more for his board and rooms than he received as pay for his services in Congress, and the voluble champion of "economical living" was compelled to confess that such was the fact. No wonder his interlocutor retorted with some bitterness that "we poor fellows who have no means outside of our salary cannot do as the gentleman does," and that "gentlemen who have private incomes of \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year are very conservative on this subject."

Frugality is undoubtedly a virtue which should be cultivated, but it is by no means a synonym for meanness. The congressman who received \$6 a day during the first twenty-five years of our history, or \$8 a day in the forty years after 1816, was able to live in much

better style relatively than he who draws \$5000 a year in 1891; for it is a matter of record that so late as during the administration of Andrew Jackson the charges at "the very best hotel" in Washington were only one dollar a day for a man's board, and half a dollar extra if he kept a horse. The system of payment originally adopted enabled the Senator or Representative to live on much the same plane as the successful professional man of a century ago; but during the hundred years the income of leading lawyers, physicians—yes, and clergymen too—has grown out of all proportion to that of the congressman. We do not ask the minister to be content with a salary so small that he must be denied the pleasures of a home, and a great nation should be ashamed to demand such a sacrifice of its lawmakers.

It would be bad enough if the evil were restricted to those who are thus really fined for their willingness to render the public service. No man can do his best work when he must live in a Washington boarding-house, or be harassed by money troubles if he tries to support a family in a house not unworthy a judge of a United States court, on a salary of \$3500 or \$4000 a year. Simply as a matter of economy, the nation "loses money" by giving niggardly salaries, because it does not get as good service as the same men would render if they were well paid. But this is not the worst of it. Love of public life, ambition for distinction, an honorable desire to do one's duty by one's country, will suffice to draw some men of the best type into the service and to keep them there, despite the discomforts imposed by poor pay. But many more of this class will soon be driven out, or, warned by the experience of others, will never enter public life.

"If any provide not for his own he is worse than an infidel," even if he neglects his family to make laws or to interpret them for his country. A man who is dependent upon what he earns, and who can earn \$10,000 or \$15,000 or \$20,000 a year outside Congress, is going to think twice before he sacrifices that income for a salary on which he cannot have a home in the city where he must live more than half the time, and cannot give his children the education which he had planned for them. And if he thinks twice, the chances are greatly against his going to Washington, or tying himself down to an even smaller salary if he be a lawyer and the path opens for him to a seat in a Federal court.

The present system operates to fill Congress with men whose wealth is so great that the size of the salary is a matter of indifference. The tendency to elect to the Senate and the House men who are rich, and who would never have been thought of for such office except for their riches, is already so strong as to be alarming, and yet the nation goes on year after year neglecting one perfectly obvious way to resist it. Make the salary of a congressman large enough for one to live as well at the close of the century as a Senator or a Representative lived at its beginning, and seats which now often go without a contest to unqualified millionaires will again be sought by men who are capable of rendering the best service to the State.

#### Early Education in Literature.

MR. CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER, in a recent "Atlantic" essay, ridiculed, with entire moderation and justice, the efforts which are made in so many of our schools and colleges to teach literature by means of a

text-book. His contention is that the only way by which literature can be taught is by planting early in the mind of the child a love for good reading, for literature of the best kind. When the seed has been sown early in that way there is little doubt about the future crop. The great difficulty in our country, with its hard-working, money-getting population, has been to find the parents who had the time to see to the sowing of the seed, for it is the parent who must be depended upon to do it rather than the teacher. Here and there may be found a teacher who will have both the disposition and the time, as well as the ability, to inculcate a love of reading with the dry humdrum instruction of learning how to read; but such a one will be the exception. In the rural district schools, as well as in the crowded city public schools, the vast majority of the teachers are so absorbed in and so exhausted by the daily drudgery of their work that they have no strength, if they had the taste and inclination, to inculcate in the pupil's mind a love of letters with his knowledge of the pronunciation, spelling, and meaning of words.

Between the tired and mechanical teacher and the overworked or indifferent parents the average American child reaches the high school, the academy, and even the college with no knowledge whatever of literature in its best sense. A few novels or poorly written histories may have been read, but beyond that no glimpse has been afforded into the fair land of letters. It would be something gained if, after the pupil had reached this stage in his education, a teacher of the inspiring and stimulating kind could always be assured to him. In many cases such a teacher is found, but in many others he is not, and the sole instruction accorded is that of perfunctory recitations from a text-book on "English Literature." Anything more absurd in the form of education could scarcely be devised than this effort to cram a student's mind with a knowledge of literature by making him commit to memory a bookful of names and dates of authors and their works. If he had any love of letters in his mind at the outset, the process would be more likely to destroy than to enlarge it.

It comes to this, therefore, that unless the parent does the early work, it is in danger of not being done at all. No one who has ever tried the experiment can doubt that a love of good literature can be created at a very early age. The child who is permitted to hear only wholesome, well-written little stories from his parents' knees before he learns to read himself, and who is given only the same kind for his first struggles, will develop a taste for those alone which will help him to reject all others as repulsive.

As for pictures, Henry James has told in *THE CENTURY* of the delight which he took as a child in poring over bound volumes of "Punch," and of the education which his eye gained thereby in regard to correct drawing. Hundreds of children have repeated his experience and are repeating it to-day, both from "Punch" and from our illustrated magazines and children's periodicals. They will early learn to detect poor drawing and to reject it as quickly as older people, and often with much less ceremony. The taste for good reading is just as quickly developed. A child who has read only stories and books of the best kind will care less for the dime novel, blood and thunder kind of stories which are so delightful to the bootblack and the mes-

senger boy. Nothing is more surprising than the sureness of the taste of the child thus developed. It chooses instinctively the best in every field, and one of the most gratifying phases of it is the frequency with which it turns to the field of history. The childish imagination, kindled by the fairy tales of the nursery, turns naturally to the heroes and battles of history, and the story of the world becomes, not dry study, but delightful reading.

In this home development of the youthful mind, this early sowing of the seed of a love of learning, the children's magazines of the present day, with their high standards of writing and illustration, are forces of incalculable power for good. They have in countless cases done the work which the parent has for one reason or another failed to do. They have by creating a solid love for the best made it forever impossible for the worst to gain a foothold in thousands of households. No more valuable educational work than this could be performed. Montaigne says that he read books that he "might learn to live and die well." The youth who comes to manhood with the love of learning firmly planted in his heart has in him the highest equipment for a useful citizen, for he will constantly read more books, will year by year shape his course more in accordance with the "garnered experience of all the ages," and will thus live and die well.

#### Women.

A WOMAN, known to honorable fame, said the other day, in conversation, that she did not wish her work to be judged with reference to her sex; that she feared that women who work in literature and art were praised unduly; and that, in fact, she was greatly tired of Woman with a big W. And yet it seems just now especially difficult to escape the consideration of the big W. Women are so active nowadays in advancing the cause not only of woman but of man, including woman, that no watcher of the signs of the times can fail to note this very apparent and important sign.

Some recent evidences of this activity suggest themselves immediately. The Open Letters in this number of *THE CENTURY* relate to a movement of the greatest significance. The opening to women of the very highest advantages in medical education on a complete equality with men; the ease with which the lately destroyed Wells College, at Aurora, New York, has been able to obtain the means beautifully to rebuild itself; the establishment of Barnard College in connection with Columbia, in the city of New York—these are matters of interest in connection with the cause of woman's higher education.

But other occurrences of the day in which women are prominent have quite as much significance—occurrences which the newspapers have not failed to keep constant note of. The work that women who have enjoyed the "higher education" are doing for their less fortunate sisters, by means of clubs, college settlements, and periodicals, is a form of endeavor which is sure to have many valuable results for the higher education, not only of the uneducated girl, but of the educated. The latter will learn—is learning—many things she has not been fully aware of concerning human nature in general, and philanthropic methods in particular. The Society for Political

Study, formed several years ago by certain women in New York, where municipal government in all its branches was first taken up and discussed,—after that coming the study of our State and general governments, and political economy in general,—is a very notable “sign”; but not more notable than, perhaps not as notable as, the practical work of the Ladies’ Health Protective Association of New York, which was organized in 1884, and ever since has been heroically fighting the battle for cleanliness and health in the metropolis. To come still nearer for “signs” we need only mention the appeal, in the recent municipal campaign, for clean streets and clean government, on the part of thirteen hundred women of our city—rich and poor, well known and obscure, laborers all, either in works of beneficence or in the winning of their daily bread.

Many who look with approval on all the “signs” mentioned above regard with a sort of apprehension the Western experiments in woman suffrage, and the serious agitation in the East for limited municipal suffrage for women, in addition to their present suffrage rights in matters of education. “Can it be,” they say, “that when wise men are looking rather to the restriction of the suffrage, there is to be a tremendous addition to it of a novel and almost revolutionary character? If in our great cities the ignorant vote is to be increased to a greater extent by the new element than by

the intelligent vote, where is the advantage?” There are others who say that just as conservative England is drifting towards socialism, so conservative America is drifting towards woman suffrage; and that just as England will move slowly, and experimentally, and wisely in the direction of socialism, stopping at the right point, so will America drift towards socialism and stop at the right point; and also drift slowly, and with many experiments and experiences, towards woman suffrage, stopping there at the right point also—even if that right point is this side of the present limitations in all suffrage; even if, by that time, male suffrage itself is restricted; the two suffrages being one wisely restricted, sacred, honorable suffrage, and not a suffrage degraded, as now, by crime and densest foreign and home-bred ignorance.

The suffrage, whatever happens, and whether or not women are generally admitted thereto, must be purged of crime against itself: those who bribe and are bribed should forfeit citizenship; habitual offenders against the laws should not have the right to make the laws; invincible ignorance should not pretend to instruct and govern at the polls; and foreigners should not be made citizens and voters without knowing anything of the rights and duties of American citizenship, or of the Constitution to which they swear allegiance.

## OPEN LETTERS.

### On the Opening of the Johns Hopkins Medical School to Women.

IT is perhaps not sufficiently understood that there is no obstacle in ecclesiastical or canon law to the education of women for the medical profession. Among the persons inhibited by the Church from pursuing the profession of medicine are included priests, monks, and clergymen generally, but not women. There are indeed canonists who would deny the right of women to teach, though not to practise, medicine—notably Schmalzgrüber, the well-known compiler of canon law: but even he, although he has taken the pains to collect, in his well-known work on Decretals, all adverse evidence, gives no explicit arguments against it; and several ecclesiastical jurists are distinctly in favor of the study of medicine by women.

If we consult history we shall find, not only that the art of midwifery during the Middle Ages, and virtually till the beginning of the eighteenth century, was exclusively in the hands of women, but also that women were from time to time engaged, during this period, in different departments of medicine. In the University of Salerno, which flourished in the Middle Ages, and was noted especially for the learning of its theologians, and in the oldest of the Italian universities, Bologna, which has recently been celebrating its eight hundredth anniversary, women were not only students but professors of medicine. The portrait of the celebrated professor of anatomy Anna Manzolini, together with those of the four other women who were professors there, may still be seen on the walls of the University of Bologna, and some of her wax anatomical models are still shown in the museum.

I do not hesitate to say, with due deference to the judgment of others, that in my opinion it is important to the well-being of society that the study of medicine by Christian women should be continued and extended. The difficulties that are said to attend their pursuing the necessary studies in the same schools with men may be obviated by judicious precautions, and these difficulties should not debar women from the profession of medicine. We permit women to exercise the art of painting, though its successful pursuit is not always free from danger to female modesty. In my judgment, in anatomical demonstrations men and women should be separated; but I learn that in the anatomical departments of Paris and Geneva, Zurich, Berne, and Basle, and in the universities of Belgium, Spain, and Italy, women work side by side with men, and that this, in the opinion of the professors, has been attended by good rather than bad results. I believe that in other departments, and wherever the proper restrictions are observed, the coeducation of the male and the female sex will exert a beneficial influence on the male.

The prejudice that allows women to enter the profession of nursing and excludes them from the profession of medicine cannot be too strongly censured, and its existence can be explained only by the force of habit. It has been urged that women do not as a rule possess the intellectual powers of men, but their ability to pursue the usual medical studies has been sufficiently demonstrated; and it is admitted, even by those who concede to men a higher order of intellect and greater powers of ratiocination, that what women may lack in that direction seems to be supplied by that logical instinct with which they have been endowed by God. It



is evident also that if female nurses may with propriety attend men as well as women, that privilege cannot reasonably be withheld from the female physician; indeed, the position of the nurse might be regarded as open to much graver objections, inasmuch as the physician makes but a transient visit to the patient, while the nurse occupies the sickroom day and night. The attendance of female physicians upon women is often of incalculable benefit. Much serious and continued suffering is undergone by women, and many beginnings of grave illness are neglected, because of the sense of delicacy which prevents them from submitting to the professional services of men. There is also an infinite number of cases, known to all who have been concerned in charitable or reformatory work, in which no influence or assistance can be so effectual as that of a physician who is also a woman and a Christian.

The alleviation of suffering, for women of all classes, which would result from the presence among us of an adequate number of well-trained female physicians cannot but be evident to all; but I wish to emphasize as strongly as possible the moral influence of such a body, than which there could be no more potent factor in the moral regeneration of society.

*James, Card. Gibbons.*

CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE, BALTIMORE.

SEVERAL months ago I was asked to state the reasons which appeared to me to show that it was both just and important to permit women medical students to attend the superior medical schools that are beginning to grow up under the direction of universities. At the time the movement had just been initiated to secure the admission of women to the medical school of the Johns Hopkins University. This movement has just been crowned with success. The generous energy of the group of women who have been working for the intellectual advancement of their sex has been cordially met by the liberal spirit of the University trustees, whose wise and just action is well befitting the responsibility of the noble trust they administer; still the moment has not yet arrived when the above mentioned "statement of reasons" has become happily superfluous.

Unless all the opportunities, privileges, honors, and rewards of medical education and the medical profession are as accessible to women as to men, women physicians cannot fail to be regarded as a special and distinctly inferior class of practitioners. Such habitual lack of social consideration will, moreover, constantly tend to render women inferior, by depressing honorable ambition, felt to be useless, and by depriving all women of the opportunities and responsibilities where individual superiority could be achieved or demonstrated, for which many at least are fitted. It is essential to the efficiency and the reputation of women's colleges that women should not be educated exclusively in them. Women's medical colleges were founded in America simply because all other means of securing a medical education for women were vehemently refused. On the European continent the foundation of such small, isolated schools would have been impossible. Women would either have been refused all legal right to study or practise medicine, or they would have been at once admitted to the schools directed by

universities and controlled by the state. The first course has been pursued in Germany, the second (since 1866) in Switzerland, France, Italy, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Belgium. In America, although for more than a century there have been among us not only acute but learned physicians, it is only recently that medicine has been regarded as a learned profession. Schools have been founded as private business enterprises whenever any group of irresponsible young men chose to "organize a college" as a means of personal advertisement. Women were excluded from these schools for the same ingenuous reason which led them to keep the standard of medical education as low as possible. The professors expected to repay themselves for their trouble out of the fees of the students: clearly the more students, the more pay; but the more severe the conditions of matriculation and graduation, the fewer the students. Similarly it was feared that the admission of women would be unpopular among students, known to be as tenacious of their "dignity" as they were careless of their instruction. Women were therefore excluded, together with the conditions necessary for a superior or learned or logical education, and may thus be said to have found themselves in good company. Now that the modern European view of medicine has gradually penetrated the American consciousness, it is perceived that the study of medicine necessitates an amplitude and complexity of intellectual and material resource greater than is required for any other branch of education. There is needed the culture of the philosophic faculty; there are needed the expensive laboratories of physical science; and in addition there is needed the equally expensive equipment of hospital and amphitheater, which especially belong to medicine. When this has once been perceived, the hope of compassing such requirements by means of small, isolated, voluntary schools, especially if unendowed and dependent on the capricious fees of their students, is seen to be futile and absurd. These schools, then, fall into their proper rank, as feeders for the university.

The relations of women's medical colleges to a university medical school, such as that of Harvard, or more especially of Johns Hopkins as the latter is designed to be, would be twofold. Certain standards imposed at the university would be accepted at the colleges as the guide for their own work—work which, without such guide, has often floundered about in woful uncertainty. And the students who should be found capable of accomplishing more than the average work proper to such colleges should be enabled to pass up to the higher schools, and work upon a plane fitted to superior abilities.

The change slowly effected in the views of medical education is an important factor in creating a new situation for the medical education of women. A second factor, not less important, consists in the change which has taken place in the general education of women. Twenty-five years ago academic studies were inaccessible to them. . . . But to-day, with Vassar, and Smith, and Wellesley, and Bryn Mawr, and Cornell University, and with admission secured to the State universities throughout the West, there are every year an increasing number of well-educated women who are qualified for the higher grades of medical work, and who are more and more in a position to demand facilities for the higher degrees of medical instruction.

A third factor in the present situation is the admission of women to the European schools, whence they return, both Europeans and Americans, to practise medicine among colleagues who have been forcibly placed at an educational disadvantage with them. Thus, out of a dozen women physicians now practising in San Francisco, three have graduated in Paris.

That the women of America, the country which, in comparison with the rest of the world, has not unjustly been called the "paradise of women," should be compelled to seek in Europe opportunities for the highest education; that in America, where the medical profession freely admits women to its national, State, and city societies, and to a share in many public medical responsibilities, women should have fewer educational advantages than in Europe, where these privileges are still denied; that in America, where physicians are beginning to be fairly liberal, just, and even kind, women should have less opportunity for winning honors than in England, where the doctors are still opposed to women physicians; that in America, with its free social manners, and habitual confidence in the dignity and purity of its women, an artificial outcry should be raised against "coeducation," and difficulties imagined, unthought of in Europe, where the honorable association of young men and women is really a social innovation; that on the Atlantic coast human beings must be deprived of intellectual rights because of alleged scruples of prudery that have vanished from the portals of universities throughout the West—all these circumstances are so anomalous, the situation thus created is so illogical and contradictory, that it cannot, one would imagine, be much longer sustained.

Notwithstanding the disadvantages under which women physicians in America still labor, there is one circumstance which renders their position more solid than it is as yet in Europe. In America the admission of women to medicine was effected in response to a popular demand—it came from below, and had a democratic basis of support. In Europe it came from above, from the councils of ministers, or from the deliberations of small groups of highly cultivated people. Thus it has often come about that in Europe women have had the education but not the patients, and in America they have had the patients and not the education. The time has come to unite the two.

NEW YORK.

Mary Putnam Jacobi, M. D.

DR. SUSAN DIMOCK was but twenty-eight years old when her body, rescued from the wreck of the *Schiller*, was borne to its last resting place by eight of the physicians of Boston, who had known her and been in practice with her for three years before her death. Among them was Dr. Henry I. Bowditch, who, speaking from an experience of more than forty years' professional life, said of her, "I found her one of the most accomplished physicians I have met." Dr. Samuel Cabot, for years one of the leading surgeons of Boston, was also one of the pall-bearers. "In her short life," he said afterward, "she acquired, in the face of many obstacles, an amount of medical knowledge and of surgical skill such as but few possess. Her skill and self-command in operating no one can appreciate who has not witnessed it. Her brief and highly honorable career points surely to the high position she would have at-

tained had her life been spared." In lecturing to her students she said, "If I were obliged, in my practice, to do without sympathy or medicine, I should say do without medicine"; and to a class in the training-school for nurses, "I wish you, of all my instructions, especially to remember this: when you go to nurse a patient, imagine that it is *your own sister* before you in that bed, and treat her in every respect as you would wish your own sister to be treated."

It was her inherent womanliness which constituted Dr. Dimock the ideal woman physician, and it is upon the womanliness of educated women that is based the strongest argument in favor of placing under their care women who are suffering from disease, either physical or mental, and women who have lost their womanliness.

To the strong, to the well, to the good, to the happy, sympathy is not an essential—they can live without it; but to the weak, the suffering, the crushed, and the wicked, sympathy is the first necessity: they must have it or they cannot be lifted and cured.

Now the sympathy which one woman can give to another it is impossible that a man should give to a woman. Even the superficial sympathy with physical suffering which arises from like experience is rendered impossible by their different organizations; a man does not know what a woman is feeling, because he never has felt and never can feel the same. This, where women are simply ill, is sufficient to make the attendance of a woman physician of value; but to women who are suffering from disease, mental or moral, women who are torn from their natural relations and place in life and shut away in insane asylums, prisons, or reformatories, for their own cure and the safety of others, the ministrations of educated, high-minded, womanly women are almost a necessity.

To have men as physicians in a prison for women, or in an insane asylum in charge of women, is simply to throw away the strongest influence for good which can possibly be available for the reformation and cure of either prisoners or patients.

To an insane patient, peace and quiet of mind, a sense of safety and repose, are essential, and to many such rest and freedom from anxiety are not possible if under the charge of a man. There is a sensitive shrinking and dread of men, often amounting to positive fear, in nervous women which may become so intensified in insane patients as to make it impossible for a man to approach them without injury to them. Apart from such extreme cases, however, the daily and hourly oversight of a woman physician is of a far more searching and intimate character than that of a man can possibly be, and it is sad that the unhappy patients should lose the comfort and advantage which the care of educated women would afford them. A woman can know a woman as a man cannot.

But to the vicious woman or girl the blessing of the presence of a woman physician seems to be almost greater than to any other. To such a one, accustomed to regard men and women from a point of view incomprehensible to other women, the entrance into her life of an absolutely pure-minded woman, who is also strong, intelligent, and kind, is a revelation. She stands self-condemned in her presence, her life for the first time presents itself to her as revolting; for the first time she sees herself as she is, defiled, degraded,

and cast out; and when such a woman stoops to perform for her the most revolting offices, shows that she loves her, that she is full of tender pity for her, the elevating influence is wonderful. To a depraved woman no man dares to show tenderness or pity; he must feel and show to her only the moral repulsion which her degradation arouses in him. Should he long to help her, to lift and succor her, he is powerless, and he cannot show her even the common pity of one human being for another who is suffering; she will not understand it, and she will pervert it in her mind, and it can do her no good, but only harm. The contact of pure men with such women can only be hardening and injurious to both, but the pure woman may give free vent to all the overpowering pity of her heart, and it serves only to soften and chasten the heart of the miserable outcast.

To one more class of the unfortunate the woman physician may come as a savior. The young girl beginning life, wayward, ignorant, unbalanced, needing help and guidance, will often conceive for a high-minded, steady-minded woman such devotion as will serve to keep her from wrong through life; and where is such a girl, beating her angry heart out against the walls of a reformatory, so likely to find her ideal as in the calm and noble woman who comes as physician and friend to cure and help her? Here, again, no man can take such a place, no man can stand in such a relation to the girl. It must be a woman who saves her, or she is lost. It is to be remembered that it is their very degradation which renders it necessary that vicious women should have the protection of good women. They cannot be left to the care of brutal men, to be at once tempters and victims; they cannot be left to the care of men of better feelings, forcing these to repress all that is best in them: they must be placed in the hands of women to whom impurity is horrible and revolting; of women who will protect them from themselves, and lead them with strong and gentle guidance out from darkness into light.

NEW YORK.

*Josephine Lowell.*

How far it may be expedient to encourage women to enter the medical profession, the work of which is often disagreeable and always laborious, is a question which receives very diverse answers; but the right of women to study medicine is now granted on all sides.

The question at issue is really one of principle, and eighteen months ago, when the Johns Hopkins Hospital was opened, it was then settled that in the opinion of the medical staff of the hospital, so far as ward work and clinics were concerned, there should be complete freedom. And this is right: if any woman feels that the medical profession is her vocation, no obstacles should be placed in the way of her obtaining the best possible education, and every facility should be offered, so that, as a practitioner, she should have a fair start in the race.

It was with great interest that I saw something of the practical working, this summer, of the Swiss medical schools, to all four of which women are now admitted on equal terms with men. It is coeducation in the fullest sense of the term, and even in the dissecting room no difference whatever is made between the sexes.

It is interesting to note, on this question, that the Basle faculty sent a communication to Zurich, asking

for a definite statement as to the feasibility of coeducation in medicine; and I believe it was on the strength of the favorable reply from the Zurich faculty that women were admitted to Basle. Professor Gaule kindly sent me a copy of the memorandum of the Zurich faculty, which in my wanderings has so far failed to reach me. One of the most distinguished members of the Berne faculty confessed to me that he had not favored coeducation, but that he had not met with any difficulties in his laboratory. He made the important observation that the success of the women students depended very much on the character of their preliminary training, and unless this was thorough they met with incessant difficulties. A member of the Zurich faculty expressed himself in the same way.

At the Paris school the utmost freedom is allowed to women, and here too it is coeducation in all departments. At lectures and demonstrations it was evident every day that the hearers and seers were considered as students only, quite irrespective of sex. Their success is shown by the increasing number of those who obtain positions as interns; at least four or five of the hospitals have now women on the house staff.

Such unrestricted coeducation is, of course, possible in America, and I do not think that the women students themselves would object to it. As a rule, I believe, they prefer to be treated as ordinary students. Many teachers complain that they feel hampered and cannot talk so plainly to a class containing women. This is true, but with practice even the most delicate subjects may be discussed from a scientific standpoint, with the utmost freedom, before a mixed class.

From the outset it was felt that a foundation like the Johns Hopkins Hospital would not fulfil its highest mission if the courses of instruction were not free to all, and they have been thus open from the beginning. No better example could be followed than that of the Paris faculty, which throws open laboratories, classrooms, and hospitals without asking any question other than that of the necessary qualifications. When organized, the Johns Hopkins Medical School will prove a new departure in medical education in this country, exacting a higher standard and a more prolonged term of study, and the only qualification for admission should be proof that the candidate has had proper preliminary training.

The success of the laboratories of a university rests in great part upon the men in control, and the extent of the equipment. The past history of the chemical, physiological, and pathological departments of the Johns Hopkins University is a sufficient guarantee for the character of the scientific work of the medical school. The success of a hospital, as a teaching center, depends partly on the men in charge, but very largely on the amount of material available for clinical instruction, and it has been stated that this would not be forthcoming in Baltimore. That the Johns Hopkins Hospital will be able to offer, in all lines, the fullest and most extensive clinical advantages, is conclusively demonstrated by the fact that already, in exactly eighteen months from the date of the opening of the institution, nearly twenty-five thousand patients have been treated in the different departments, and the hospital thus ranks with the first clinical schools of the continent.

JOHNS HOPKINS HOSPITAL.

*William Osler, M. D.,  
Physician-in-Chief.*

WITH more than a score of women in a dozen States filling medical appointments which are by law open to their sex only; with the number of women doctors in this country now reaching the thousands, and with a demand for their services so great that even if inadequately trained they only too readily find employment; when women are admitted in Europe to opportunities for medical education on the same terms with men—it seems almost a work of supererogation to explain and defend such facts, or to attempt to reason why they should or should not be.

“The moving finger writes, and, having writ,  
Moves on.”

The position of women, except of those who have incomes or the capacity to earn them, is, in the main, too dependent for the maintenance of the highest character and self-respect under the various vicissitudes of life, and for self-support when other sources fail. Were there no other reason, this is enough to throw wide open to them all the avenues of work which they choose to enter. The higher education of women, as I read the evidence, has already shown that the firmer mental balance which they get thereby is already telling in improved physical health. If they are naturally more emotional than men, and have less self-control, so much the more do they need training to steady them, and at the same time to bring outside interests which will prove a resource against indoor cares.

If it be argued that women have not the self-reliance, uniformly good judgment, physical strength, and power of unremitting labor necessary to the practice of medicine, the most that can be reasonably claimed is that any conspicuous lack of those qualities belongs only to certain, not to all, women, as it applies to some men, and that it is often compensated by quicker intuition. The choice of doctors between women and men, so far as these considerations are concerned, will naturally be governed by the same laws as a selection between different men, and, including such matters as night-work, exposure, kinds of practice taken up, may safely be left to the women who study medicine and to those who employ them.

Finally, many people who have studied the evolution of the human brain through its instinctive, social, and various intellectual stages until the highest cerebral attributes are reached in the great moral qualities, have not been able to understand that the study of medicine, admitted to be ennobling to men, should be degrading to women, and robs them of their finest traits.

The belief that a sort of social convulsion might follow the general practice of medicine by women, disinclining them to marry, and unfitting them for maternal duties, may be easily corrected by a study of human nature and the observance of individual cases, or by the Massachusetts census of 1885, which, in a population of 1,942,111, shows 48,843 more women than men between the ages of twenty and forty-nine inclusive, 140,160 women in professional, government, trade, and manufacturing occupations, and only 4236 persons practising medicine of all the kinds known to the census. Women physicians are needed for the care and protection of young girls, to save them from ill-informed or misguided mothers, who by not teaching daughters what they should know may entail upon them injury or unhappiness for life, through their ig-

norance of simple physiological laws. It is true that in this respect and in special treatment the woman physician has opportunities to do harm which men cannot have. But the remedy is to offer abundant facilities for education beyond that danger line.

I am quite sure that there is no risk of lowering the intellectual standard of medical education if women and men study together. On the contrary, it should be raised by a free competition from a new standpoint. While there is no indelicacy in a woman's consulting her physician upon any point on which she desires information or treatment, the choice should always be open to her to ask advice from one thoroughly informed of her own sex, whenever she so prefers. The community needs, too, a woman's educational view of morality, rectifying and raising standards; and therein, perhaps, is one opportunity of many for the woman physician of the future to help. By bringing the work of the best women into the practice of medicine the medical profession must be benefited and the world may be improved.

Until money is freely available for endowing new medical schools, the only way in which women can have equal terms with men is to be allowed the same. Will, then, our leading medical schools, all of which need money, lose anything by giving women the same advantages with men, and requiring their work to be judged by precisely the same standards? Not to quote Paris, Zurich, Basle, it is claimed that no harm has come from coeducation in the thirty-eight medical schools which announce their courses as open to both sexes in this country; and it may be added that time generally proves repressive measures in education to be at best unwise. It was logical, perhaps inevitable, that the Johns Hopkins Medical School, starting without traditions or prejudices, and with its special facilities for advanced study, should admit women on the same terms with men, and the first great university to give to women medical students the same advantages as to men is likely to find it profitable to do so, and will gain the support of those people who are enough interested in the movement in time to give their money freely to it.

BOSTON.

*Charles F. Folsom, M. D.*

THE admission of women to the medical school of the Johns Hopkins University affects very closely those interested in the intellectual life of women.

The requirements for admission are in themselves of great importance to women's colleges, because the preliminary medical course organized by the Johns Hopkins University is such as can be given in all colleges properly equipped for collegiate instruction in science, and cannot be given where there is lack of scientific apparatus or neglect of scientific methods. Little by little, we may hope, those institutions where it cannot be obtained will be discredited; and in those colleges where it raises the standard of scientific instruction it will necessarily, by reason of the interdependence which exists among college courses, raise the standard of all other work as well. It may be said that as a comparatively small number of students of science intend to embrace the profession of medicine, the effect of the requirements for admission to a medical school on the ordinary scientific course of a college can be but slight. This, however, is an error. More and more, as

women realize that there is for them, as for men, a choice of futures, the determination will grow not to be excluded in advance from any portion of this choice. Though the number of girls that go to college remains comparatively small, the custom will, I believe, soon cease of sending girls to schools that make admission to college impossible, or possible only after half-wasted years of supplementary instruction; and the habit of choosing college studies as though for the term of college existence only, without reference to the possibility of their continuance or application in future years, will cease, I think, still sooner. More and more, for women as for men, graduate study, and the continuity of the intellectual life implied in graduate study, is the question of the day.

Medicine is not only to students of the natural sciences one of the most important branches of graduate study. It is also, broadly speaking, the only one of the so-called learned professions as yet fully open to women, and the recent action of the Johns Hopkins University will, for the first time, put the women who are about to engage in it on an equal footing with the most fortunate of the men. For the present, at least, the medical profession occupies the foreground of the attention of those concerned for women's intellectual advancement, and it will always, as it seems to me, retain a peculiar interest; for of other professions, even should they become as easily accessible to women as that of medicine, it can at most be said that women are as well fitted for them as men, whereas there is an infinite amount of good to be effected in the practice of medicine which can be effected by none but women.

What this good is in many other directions has been said by others; but I wish to point out how much may be achieved by the woman physician — above all by the woman physician who has herself had a college education, or its equivalent, and has then passed to the study of medicine at such a school as that of the Johns Hopkins — for the furtherance of the intellectual life of women in general. My experience among college students has shown me the need of such a physician, and I think that for the present, or until men have learned that for women as well as for themselves intellectual activity is the keenest of possible lifelong pleasures and a safeguard against a multitude of evils, the skilled and sympathetic woman physician, rather than the man, should accompany young girls through their school and college life. She will be less ready to secure physical health for her patients at the expense of intellectual development, and less hopeful of so securing it. She will prescribe sheer idleness as a remedy neither for the indispositions of girls in their teens, nor for the ill-health of college students. She will have constantly present to her an adequate conception of the ideal or normal life of women, and will understand and know how to remove or diminish the difficulties in the way of its realization. Moreover, her assistance will be available where that of men is not, and will serve to avoid and alleviate much needless suffering; for every one who has had the good fortune to be the friend and adviser of young girls must feel that there are cases in which she could not advise them to consult a male physician.

It will be asked by some, why the studies necessary to place women in the front rank of the medical profession cannot be pursued in a college or university intended for women only. There may be alleged in answer, the difficulty of duplicating such costly appa-

ratus, and the non-existence in America of a hospital for the use of women students like the Johns Hopkins Hospital; but perhaps the best answer is this, that these studies are graduate studies. The difference between graduate and undergraduate coeducation is seldom sufficiently insisted on, and yet it is a vital one, and whenever the battle of coeducation is fought the two should be carefully distinguished. In graduate study, where the students are necessarily mature in age, richer in knowledge, fewer in numbers, tried and sifted by the tests of examinations, of perseverance, of life with its embarrassments, hindrances, and vicissitudes, the disadvantages of coeducation are at a minimum, and its advantages are at a maximum.

Again, it is almost essential for those who are to devote their lives to any branch of knowledge that they should come into contact with those of their contemporaries who are destined to succeed in it, and should measure themselves against them. The few in whom lies the future of any science are all but indispensable associates to one another; to exclude women from such association is, speaking generally, to exclude them from the delights of intellectual competition and the possibility of fame.

The Johns Hopkins University is the center of graduate instruction in this country: the main stress of its activity has been laid, and its American and European reputation rests, on its graduate schools. Its purposes, as soon as it shall have amassed the requisite supplementary endowment, to open the first school of medicine ever organized in the United States as a graduate school, and it has marked its sense of the difference between graduate and undergraduate coeducation by resolving, in response to a widespread movement on the part of the women of America, to admit women to this school, whenever it shall open, on the same terms as men. That women on their part realize the difference between a graduate and an undergraduate school, in influence, in range of activity, and in national importance, is shown by the rapid organization in every part of the United States from Boston to New Orleans, and from Baltimore to San Francisco, of the committees for the Women's Fund of the Medical School of the Johns Hopkins University.

In this movement it may be noted with satisfaction that women have from the beginning come forward not only asking but offering. In October they had already secured one-fifth the sum requisite for opening the medical school. The proportion should be so largely increased before March 15 as to give emphatic evidence that a school all the advantages of which are for women as well as for men may count not only on public sympathy but on the fullest measure of financial support.

*M. Carey Thomas.*

DEAN'S OFFICE, BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

#### The Artist Bunker.

THE beautiful picture "The Mirror" engraved for this number of the magazine, is one of Mr. Bunker's most recent works, having been painted in the spring of 1890, and shown for the first time at the last exhibition of the Society of American Artists. It attracted a great deal of attention at this exhibition, and when shown later at the Art Institute of Chicago was awarded the James W. Ellsworth prize of three hundred dollars

for the best picture in the exhibition painted by a living American artist.

Dennis Miller Bunker was born in New York, November 6, 1861, and began drawing while he was going to school in the city, entering the Academy schools afterwards as a regular pupil in 1878. He did not remain there very long, but attended the classes in drawing and painting from life at the Art Students' League, working there until the autumn of 1881, when he sailed for Paris. After spending three months at the Académie Julian and in the class of Hébert at the École des Beaux-Arts, he became a pupil of Gérôme and worked in his class at the Beaux-Arts until 1884, when he returned to New York. He has been abroad once since, having spent the summer of 1888 with John S. Sargent at Calcott, near Reading, in England, where he painted landscapes.

Mr. Bunker's first pictures were exhibited at the Academy and elsewhere several years before he went abroad. Most of these were landscapes, and while he was a student in New York he painted and sold a good many pictures, and was well known during this period as a water-color painter. The first picture he exhibited after his study in Paris was a figure of a

young man in a studio playing a guitar, and was called "Bohemia." For this picture he received the third Hallgarten prize at the exhibition at the Academy in 1885, and he was elected a member of the Society of American Artists the same year. In 1886 he went to Boston, where he was the principal instructor in drawing and painting from life at the Cowles Art School. During his stay in Boston he painted a large number of portraits and sent two or three pictures to the New York exhibitions. He came back to New York last year, and died in Boston, December 28, 1890.

Although not lacking in refinement and delicacy, his work is essentially robust and virile. His portraits invariably show that he has striven to represent character as well as the more superficial qualities that go to make a likeness, and they are marked by an evident love of truth. His work, whether in figure or landscape painting, is serious in intention and is distinguished by excellent color quality. In "The Mirror" sincerity and grace are very happily blended, and the picture is especially notable for elegance of line and beauty of expression. The color scheme — a simple one of whites and grays — is harmonious, and the canvas is excellent in *ensemble*.

William A. Coffin.

## BRIC-À-BRAC.

### SONGS OF IRELAND.

BY JENNIE E. T. DOWE.

#### I Axed Her to Marry Me.

THE first time I met her, I axed her to marry me ;  
She said go away an' why will y' harry me ;  
To marry so young is nothing but slavery,  
And to harry me thus is the deepest o' knavery :  
In spite of it all she was trying to tarry me,  
But I said, I will go an' some day you 'll marry me !

I waited a week, an' I axed her to pity me,  
I said you are older, an' surely will marry me ;  
If yiz die an old maid jist think on your sorrow,  
An offer to-day is not good on the morrow ;  
She said she was shocked along o' the brass o' me,  
An' if I waited a year she never would marry me !

I thought it all over, an' then it did worry me,  
I waited a day an' axed her to marry me ;  
Down on my knees most humbly a-kneeling,  
I told her my love wid the deepest o' feeling ;  
She said here again, get out o' the sight o' me,  
There is a nice man who is going to marry me !

Then the divil he rose, an' he ruled in the breast o' me,  
Says I an' begor she will yet be the best o' me !  
We passed widout speaking, me eyes on the ground,  
But faix an' the colleen kept turning around ;  
Says I to meself, I am sure she will marry me,  
If 't is scornin' enough I only will carry me !

Me coat wid a tail I put on the back o' me,  
An' me cousin Noreen I hung on the arm o' me,  
An' the scornin' colleen, be she this or be there,

I kicked up me heels wid a divil me care —  
An' Noreen is so sweet I 'm crazy to tarry me,  
An' t' other colleen is crazy to marry me !

#### Sweet Nora, leave your Cloak with Me.

THE night is long before me,  
And lonely is the night,  
With thee, my treasure, stolen  
From out my tender sight ;  
Oh, slowly hasten parting,  
Thy love is all forlorn —  
Sweet Nora, leave your cloak with me,  
For comfort till the morn.

I 'll cuddle close beside thy gate,  
And guard thy slumbers sweet,  
Until 'vourneen at break o' day  
We once again may meet ;  
In thy bright dreams I pray one thought,  
Thou 't give thy love forlorn —  
Sweet Nora, leave your cloak with me,  
For comfort till the morn.

I 'll wrap its folds about me close,  
And, in my fancy bold,  
I 'll think sweet Nora's golden head  
Upon my breast I hold ;  
I 'll dream of all the happy days  
We 've wandered ne'er forlorn —  
Sweet Nora, leave your cloak with me,  
For comfort till the morn.

## TOPICS OF THE TIME.

### The People and Finance.

THERE are a few elementary principles in economic science the mastery of which by the great body of the American people would be of incalculable value to us as a nation. One of these is that no government can create money out of anything which it may choose to call money. Another is that all classes of the people, rich and poor, laborer and employer, are far better off with a sound and stable currency than they are with any of the varieties of "cheap money." Another is that no part of the financial or business world can be benefited or injured by changes in the monetary standard of value without corresponding benefit or injury to the other parts. Still another is that the larger part of the business of the country is transacted upon credit, and that anything which tends to disturb or to foreshadow disturbances of the monetary standard of value cripples credit and demoralizes all business. Finally, though we have by no means exhausted the list, it would be of the highest importance for the common people to become thoroughly convinced of the fact that in every instance in which the financial world is disturbed by changes or threats of changes in the standard of value the sufferers are always the poorer people and the beneficiaries always the rich, for the latter are able to guard against the coming trouble which they are quick to scent, while the former are powerless to take the necessary precautions even if they were able to anticipate them.

The pernicious delusion that the Government has the power to create money is traceable directly to the legal tender act of 1862. Previous to that time the American people, in common with those of other enlightened nations, believed that the sole function of government in relation to money was to certify to the weight and purity of the metal contained in it. This view, which, it is scarcely necessary to say, has been shown by the experience of all civilized countries to be the only sound one, was completely upset in the minds of thousands of uninstructed people by the issue of the legal tenders and the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court upholding the right of Congress to make such issue. The pernicious doctrine that anything which the Government might choose to stamp as money—paper, or silver, or nickel, or copper—became *ipso facto* money for the amount named on its face obtained so firm a lodgment in the popular mind that calls began to be heard from all quarters for the liberal issue of Government money in almost every form except—gold. The country has passed safely through several varieties of the "greenback craze," which was the most radical and dangerous form of the delusion, but it has yet to reach the solid ground occupied before the war. So long as the admission is allowed that the Government can create money there is no satisfactory answer to be made to the questions, "Why should we have a gold standard?" "Why should we have national banks?" or "Why should we have any limit put to the volume of our currency?" If the Government can create money,

why should it not create all that everybody wants? Why should anybody work for a living?

We must get back as a people to a just comprehension of the truth that no government can make an inferior form of money equal in value to a superior form like gold by enacting a law decreeing that it shall become so, and that it cannot do this for the simple reason that the superior form costs more, and it is this cost which constitutes its value as a medium of exchange. The kind of money which every man wants is the kind which will buy the most of the things which he needs—that is, have the largest purchasing power. Nothing is clearer than that cheap money means high prices, and dear money means low prices. Cheap money is as costly for a nation as it is for an individual. Mr. H. C. Adams has demonstrated very convincingly that the legal tenders made the expense of our civil war greater by \$800,000,000 than it would have been had they never been issued. With individuals the only man who is benefited by a change from a dear money to a cheaper one is he who owes money—that is, belongs to what is called the debtor class. He is rid at once of a portion of his debt, because he can pay it in money of less value than that in use at the time of the debt's contraction. But to the average man, the wage-earner of every variety, the change means greatly increased cost of living with no increase of income. He still receives the same number of dollars as wages, but each dollar buys less than it did before. If he has debts, the depreciation of them is by no means in the same proportion as in his wages. Suppose, for example, he is receiving \$1000 a year and that he owes \$1000. A reduction of ten per cent. in the value of money means that his wages have been cut down one-tenth—that is, that he will lose \$100 each year, whereas his debt has only been reduced \$100 for all time.

The people who would benefit at first by a change to cheap money are farmers and others who have property which is heavily mortgaged, and who would be thus relieved of a portion of their debt. The case of the farmer who has been forced to mortgage his farm is a peculiarly hard one. His condition has been growing worse and worse yearly, for many reasons, but chiefly because most of the things he has had to buy have been taxed, while the chief products of his farm have not. He has been forced to buy at the higher prices of a restricted home market, and to sell at the prices set in the unrestricted market of the world. A change to a cheaper form of money would give him relief, provided he were able to pay off his debt at once, but otherwise his gain would be only in his ability to pay his interest money in a cheaper currency. He would suffer, in common with all others of the hard-working class, from the inevitable evils attendant upon cheap money, with the dear goods which such money always brings in its train. Then, too, he would discover, in case he wished to procure further loans, that he must obtain them on a gold basis, for the mere hint of the coming of a cheaper cur-

rency is sufficient always to force capitalists into the defensive position of loaning large amounts on that basis alone. In the end the farmer would find that his last condition was worse than his first, and that his every effort to gain relief through legislation which promised to make "money plenty" had the same result, namely, to put him more helplessly in the power of men whose chief business is to speculate in money.

Another class of temporary beneficiaries from cheaper money are employers, who are able to pay their employees in the cheap money, in small amounts, at its full nominal value, while obtaining it for such payment in large amounts and at its gold value. Yet we believe it is a fact that the great body of employers are agreed that the slight gains which are possible in this way are far from being an adequate set-off to the losses caused to all business by the uncertainties of an unstable currency. Another class is composed of the professional speculators in gold and the hoarders of gold, who, because of their possession of capital, are able to speculate in the superior money at the expense of the great mass of the people, who are compelled to accept the inferior medium of exchange.

All this leads naturally and inevitably to the general conclusion that the best money for all classes in the long run — of course, including the farmers — is that which is most stable in value; that is, which most completely and steadily serves the purpose of a medium of exchange. It should be constantly borne in mind that the great volume of the business of the country, what is called exchange of commodities, is conducted on credit. Statistics show that the proportion of the trade of the country that is carried on by means of money to that carried on by means of credit instruments is in the ratio of about one to nine. The mere hint of a change in the value of money sends a thrill of alarm along the entire credit system, and leads to instantaneous contraction. This is at once felt in every branch of business and industry. There is at once a double strain put upon the trade of the country. Gold and currency are hoarded in anticipation of approaching uncertainty of values, and credit is given only in cases of the strongest security. All our most serious commercial troubles, our panics, and threatened panics, our tight money markets and business stringencies, are directly traceable to this contraction of credit; yet the uninstructed public almost invariably calls for the issue of cheaper money as the only remedy, not recognizing that the mischief has been caused, not by a scarcity of currency, but by a contraction of credit.

There ought to be a more general recognition of the fact that the economic administration of a nation, the regulation of its currency and finances, calls for expert ability of a rare kind. In every generation there are comparatively few men who have the requisite intellectual equipment for this task, and in almost every other civilized country except ours they are sought out and put in exclusive charge of it. Few intelligent people venture upon the experiment of being their own doctors or lawyers, recognizing the superior fitness of expert ability to perform those functions. Why should we as a nation be less wise? We must sooner or later realize the folly of our course, and must put the control of our finances into the hands of a few tried and trained financiers, who shall be removed absolutely beyond the influence of popular clamor. We shall

then have far less trouble than we have now. The people at large would be benefited in every way, and in none more so than through the restrictions which such administration of our finances would put upon the activities of certain conscienceless manipulators in Wall street, who find now their best opportunities for mischief in the uncertainty which constant meddling with the standard of value inevitably produces.

#### Organized Municipal Reform.

THERE were causes for both encouragement and discouragement in the municipal elections of last autumn. The intelligent and praiseworthy attempt which was made in New York City to overthrow Tammany Hall met with disastrous and somewhat disheartening failure, but there were compensating successes in other cities, notably in Boston and Providence. It is to be noted as of much significance that the elections in the last two cities were held on other than the regular election days, coming a few weeks after the November elections for congressmen. In Boston a worthy and progressive man who was nominally a Democrat was chosen over a Republican of the extreme partizan type, by a majority much larger than that by which the Democrats had carried the city in the congressional election. In Providence a worthy and progressive Republican was chosen over a Democrat of the extreme partizan type, though the city had given a Democratic majority in the congressional election. In addition to Boston there were eight other Massachusetts cities in which notable reform results were achieved. Six of them which had given Democratic majorities in November turned about in December and elected Republican mayors, and two of them which had given Republican majorities in November turned about and elected Democratic mayors in December. In every case the best man won without regard to party. In all these cities there was no other than municipal issues at stake, and the result was, therefore, a valuable illustration of the importance of separate municipal elections.

In fact, it is generally admitted by all students of the problem of municipal misgovernment that the first step towards reform must be through the attainment of separate elections. Whether these shall be in the spring or fall is a question about which opinions differ. If they are held in the spring, experience has shown that it is somewhat difficult to arouse public interest. Then, too, an election at such a time involves large expense, requiring the setting in motion anew of complete election machinery, and making necessary a new registration of voters. If elections are held in the fall, and at a date closely subsequent to the regular elections, these objections would be modified, though not entirely removed. After an exciting campaign which had closed in a general election in November it might be found difficult to induce the voters to take a lively interest in a municipal election three or four weeks later; but the machinery of the November election, with the registration list, would be in readiness for use, and the expense would not be great. So far as the question of popular interest is concerned, the experience of cities in Massachusetts and Rhode Island shows that there is little to be feared on this score. There is almost always sufficient interest to



make certain the choice of the most desirable candidates, and that is the chief end to be sought.

It has been proposed in New York State to have separate fall elections for municipal officers, held on the regular November date, but on alternate years from national and State elections. To bring this about a constitutional amendment has been proposed and has been brought before the legislature for consideration, but has not been acted upon. Under its provisions the terms of the governor and all other State officers would be so extended that they would hold office four years instead of three, senators four years instead of two, and assemblymen two years instead of one. Municipal elections would be held on odd years, and State and national on even years. The amendment applied to the whole State, and was, therefore, a comprehensive plan of municipal reform. Under its provisions there would be no more elections in number than at present, and consequently no increase in expense. The main objection raised to the plan has been that it lengthened the terms of State and legislative officers, and would on that account be certain to incur great popular hostility; but this was, of course, mere inference, since the only way in which to test popular sentiment upon that point would be to submit the proposal to a vote of the people. There are many States in which terms of similar length, and even greater, are to be found, and no objection to them has been heard. The doubling of the term of members of the Assembly might lead to biennial sessions of the New York legislature, and the experience of thirty-six States, which have adopted that method, justifies the assertion that the change would be in the direction of progress.

It is not our purpose to pass judgment upon these or any other plans for bringing about reforms in our municipal affairs. What we should like to see would be the organization in every large city of the land of an earnest and intelligent body of men who should make the whole question of municipal rule the object of systematic, educational work. One great reason why so little has been accomplished in this field is that all previous efforts towards reform have been spasmodic. What is needed is a permanent organization in every city, which would be disbanded by neither temporary victory nor defeat, but would continue its work until municipal government by the intelligence and morality of the community should be so surely established that it could never be overthrown. The remarkable results achieved within three years by the ballot reform agitation show what can be accomplished by work of this kind. It is only necessary to get the people interested and to demonstrate to them the merits of the case. After that the politicians have no alternative except to do what the people direct.

Municipal reform organizations could examine thoroughly the merits of the various separate election-day plans, and submit to the legislatures a measure embodying the results of their labors. If this were to fail at the first trial, it could be pushed again and again until it became a law. This was the method pursued with ballot reform, and the final victory came so speedily as to astonish even the most sanguine of its promoters. After separate elections had been obtained, other plans of municipal reform could be taken up and pushed to accomplishment in the same way. Experience in this and other countries has shown two things,

unmistakably — first, that a reform is secured when the people are brought to a correct understanding of it; second, that when a reform is established, either by law or in a system of government, there is no reversion to the old method. The European cities which have been redeemed from partizan and corrupt rule have not returned to the old order of things, and are in no danger of doing so. Our civil service and ballot reform laws will never be repealed. If we can get municipal reform established and its wisdom demonstrated in practice, the fight will be over for all time; though vigilance will, of course, always be necessary to secure the fruits of the victory. The work is a great one, and it will require time, intelligence, perseverance, and courage; but it is one which ought to arouse the spirit and command the willing devotion of every American who loves his country and desires to serve it, for to strike a death-blow at municipal misrule will be to aim at the destruction of the very deadliest of the evils which threaten the existence of free institutions.

#### Unregarded Literary Standards.

THE education — or, to speak more correctly, the miseducation — of the masses is largely based upon literary standards which are seldom regarded. The use of words, the construction of sentences — in short, the fundamental principles of the English language — are learned from authorities that are hardly thought of.

Consider the case of the foreign immigrant who comes to New York and seeks to master our language. He rides on the street-car, or upon an elevated railway train, and hears the conductor or the guard use certain expressions; he enters the ferry-house and takes a boat across one of the rivers, and he finds signs in English on the doors of the waiting-rooms and over the entrances to the cabins; he visits the great shops, and listens to the clerk or the floor-walker. What has he encountered as the word applied indiscriminately to the female sex? Almost everywhere, "lady." "There's a seat, lady," says the car conductor; "Here's your change, lady," echoes the shop-girl; "Ladies' Room," "Ladies' Cabin," stare the signs before him.

It has been even worse where the male sex was concerned. "Lady" is at least a complete word, which can stand by itself. But what has been its counterpart? A vulgar abbreviation, which, however, has masqueraded as a full-grown word that had no cause for shame. If the foreigner left the metropolis for any other part of the country he found himself defined by transportation companies as a "gent," and directed to a "Gents' Waiting-Room." To make confusion worse confounded, the apostrophe was almost as likely as not to have strayed from its proper position, so that the sign would read "Gent's Waiting-Room." The native of France or Germany who left the Old World a full-grown man found himself reduced to a mere "gent" on his arrival in the New!

Oliver Wendell Holmes has spoken of

The thing named "pants" in certain documents,  
A word not made for gentlemen, but "gents."

It is therefore eminently proper that there should be a grammar for "gents," and the newcomer was very likely to encounter samples of it on his travels. A few years ago the main line of railroad between Boston and New York began running one of its express trains

from New Haven to the metropolis without any stop. For a long time after the change was made passengers on this train, while it paused in the evening at New Haven, were regaled with the announcement in stentorian tones by a brakeman, "This train don't make no stops between New Haven and New York."

It is related of a brakeman, who was once censured for the unintelligible tones in which he shouted the names of the stations, that he told his superior, "You can't expect a first-class tenor voice for thirty dollars a month." Neither should one demand a professor of philology in such a position. But we may at least expect that great transportation companies shall see to it that the English language is not maltreated under their auspices, and that great shopkeepers shall forbid employes to commit verbal atrocities upon unoffending patrons. It is pleasant to note some signs of a change for the better in these respects. One at least of the New York establishments which set the fashions in such matters has instructed its clerks to drop "Lady" and substitute "Madam" in addressing any woman. More than one of the companies running ferryboats across the North or East rivers have withdrawn "lady" and "gent" from their signs, and returned to the good old Saxon words "men" and "women." The same commendable reform is beginning to be observable in the stations on some of the leading railroad lines. It is not in the ferryboat, or the railroad station, or the "emporium of fashion" that one would look for signs of culture, but unhappily vast numbers of people are affected for good or bad by the literary standards which there prevail, and it is therefore most encouraging that correct ideas of English should be making headway in such places.

#### Success with Honor.

THE recent publication of two books concerning Mr. George W. Childs, containing his "Recollections," and describing his well-known gifts to England,<sup>1</sup> affords the opportunity of a word or two on one of the most remarkable and exemplary careers in the annals of journalism. Whenever two or three working journalists are discussing among themselves the strange condition of journalism in our day, as a profession subject justly to both the highest praise and the most severe condemnation, these working journalists—whenever they are not setting forth the usual explanations of the faults charged upon certain branches of journalism—are apt to lay the chief blame for whatever is confessedly wrong on the men who own the periodicals, and who require the doing of certain things which are not savory; or who for purely business reasons put their writers under compulsion either to twist, evade, or suppress the truth. In saying that this is the frequent talk among working journalists we are merely recording a fact known throughout the length and breadth of journalism. Reporters and editorial writers say the same thing, and they say it often with as much force as frankness.

Every one will admit that the paper owned and con-

ducted by Mr. Childs is among the many that have suffered no moral deterioration through their ownership. Mr. Childs in his "Recollections" says:

I worked hard to make the paper a success; for several years I seldom left the editorial rooms before midnight, averaging from twelve to fourteen hours a day at the office. I strove to elevate its tone, and I think I succeeded. If asked what I mean by this, perhaps I had better quote the friendly words of the late Rev. Dr. Prime: "Mr. Childs excluded from the paper all details of disgusting crime; all reports of such vice as may not be with propriety read aloud in the family, that poison the minds of young men, inflame the passions and corrupt the heart; all scandal and slang, and that whole class of news which constitutes the staple of many daily papers. The same rule was applied to the advertising columns, and from them was excluded all that, in any shape or form, might be offensive to good morals."

The result is known to the whole world. Leaving entirely aside the rewards of conscience and of self-respect, and without regard to the pleasant history of Mr. Childs's hospitalities, public and private benefactions, and his relation to his own employes and to the labor interests of the country at large, it might well be asked how many of the journalistic successes born of sensationalism and a low estimate of editorial responsibility and of public virtue and public taste are likely to have the substantial success of the journalistic business founded by Mr. Childs—a business firmly established on the basis of good principles, good feelings, and the honorable obligations of good citizenship.

Walter Howe.

THE fine and manly countenance of Walter Howe, which appears in this number of the magazine in connection with the article on the Century Club, is a reminder of the heavy loss sustained by this community in his recent most tragic and untimely death.<sup>2</sup> No city in the world is in greater need than New York of the abilities and example of men possessing just the qualities of Walter Howe—men with a faculty for affairs, with unshaken principles, with wisdom and energy in action, and a disinterested spirit.

That such a man had his origin and training under the difficult conditions of New York city and New York State politics, and that other men of his kind have had in recent years their origin, training, and opportunity here, show that we must not despair of the local battle for decency and good government. The band of party reformers to which he belonged and the reformers in the opposite party with whom he always gladly coöperated are not dispersed; accessions to the ranks of both are constantly being made, and will increase in numbers, we do not doubt, till our New York city and State governments will cease to be cited throughout the world as shining examples of the alleged failure of free institutions.

<sup>1</sup> The Stratford-upon-Avon Memorial Fountain, the Herbert, Cowper, and Milton windows, and the Andrewes and Ken reredos. For Matthew Arnold's address on the unveiling of the Milton window, see THE CENTURY for May, 1888.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Howe was drowned while bathing at Newport last summer.

## OPEN LETTERS.

### Mr. Lodge on Civil Service Reform.

THE article of Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, entitled "Why Patronage in Offices is Un-American," which appeared in the October CENTURY, will be read with attention by every civil service reformer, and by all those who are interested in the progress of good government. The style is vigorous and incisive; the arguments are clearly stated, and well arranged. In a concise historical sketch Mr. Lodge shows that the system of patronage in offices is "a system born of despotisms and aristocracies, and . . . as un-American as anything could well be." He proves conclusively the validity of the arguments in favor of the merit system, and the absurdity and untruthfulness of the arguments against it. I heartily agree with Mr. Lodge that "there is only one thing more contemptible than a feeble imitation of other people, and that is an equally feeble refusal to adopt something intrinsically good because somebody else has tried something like it and found it beneficial." It is to be hoped that this article may prove a death-blow to that venerable falsehood, that the merit system is un-American, which has so long hindered civil service reform.

While gratefully acknowledging the value of Mr. Lodge's paper as a contribution to civil service reform literature, and cordially indorsing his main conclusions, and the arguments supporting them, there are two positions to which exception must be taken.

*First.* As to the origin of the patronage system and the views of the "especial advocates of the reform" concerning it. To them is attributed the belief that "in the good old days . . . the evils of modern public life . . . did not exist. Everybody who held office then was good and able, and was chosen or appointed solely from merit, while selfish politicians and mercenary lobbyists were unknown. In short, human nature then was something very different from what it is to-day." They are also said to be convinced that "patronage in offices sprang full fledged from the brain of Andrew Jackson." I do not know of any prominent civil service reformer who has studied early American history who holds these remarkable views. George William Curtis, who can speak as the representative "ardent reformer" if any one can, in his address before the National Civil Service Reform League in 1888 asserted that under such leaders as Hamilton and Jefferson party spirit doubtless ran as high as it does to-day, and that upon the establishment of the National Government Washington was compelled to rebuke the undignified haste of many in their efforts to obtain office.

Mr. Lodge admits that Washington "was guided by the highest and most disinterested motives" in making appointments, but adds that "it is equally certain that he distributed the offices solely as a matter of patronage." This last assertion, I think, can be easily disproved. The fact that Washington appointed only friends of the Constitution to office upon the inauguration of his administration does not prove that

he was a partizan, but merely that he used common sense. Had he done otherwise he would have imperiled our national existence.

Andrew Jackson represented a school of political thought which first gained the ascendancy on his accession to the presidency. This school believed that hitherto the Government had been too aristocratic, and that civil officers could best be made to feel their responsibility to the people by making their retention in office depend on the people's will as expressed in national elections. It regarded offices as gifts of the nation, and thought that as many persons as possible should have an opportunity to obtain these gifts. It did not possess sufficient discrimination to distinguish between officials who have the power to change or determine the policy of the nation in political matters and those who have not. More thought was given to the gaining of federal offices than to efficiency in the discharge of the duties incident to them. The fact that Jackson regarded his political opponents as aristocrats, hostile to the best interests of the country which he represented, explains his zeal in turning them out of office. He was convinced that the people demanded a change.

It is not contended by the reformers that our earlier Presidents were invariably consistent in their appointments, nor do they assert that "patronage in offices sprang full fledged from the brain of Andrew Jackson." The "spoils system" was a natural development, founded on the average citizen's ignorance of the true nature and functions of governments. The seeds of it were sown with the establishment of the Government, as Mr. Lodge truly observes. These matured gradually but did not bring forth abundant fruit till Jackson's administration, and then not because any one man had cared for them, but because they had taken root in the heart of the average citizen. It is also not denied that the merit system which depends on the competitive examination is a modern invention. What the civil service reformer desires is not a return to an ancient system, but an acknowledgment of the principle laid down by Washington and Madison, that public office is a trust, and the complete overthrow of the un-American idea which has prevailed from Jackson's time till recently, that public office is a gift.

*Secondly.* Mr. Lodge deprecates that "with each succeeding Administration there is a loud cry raised that the spirit of the reform is not respected in regard to those offices which are confessedly filled by patronage," and remarks that "it is much to be wished that the charge of hypocrisy and pharisaism made by the opponents of the reform had no foundation." It does not seem at all strange that a loud cry should be raised when Presidents and parties distinctly and emphatically pledge themselves, before elections, to observe the spirit and purpose of civil service reform, and, after elections, violate their pledges in the most open and unblushing manner. In fact, a loud and vigorous protest is the natural result of such faithlessness. When an officer is appointed solely as a reward for political services

the outcry is caused by the fact that not the Pendleton bill, but the principle on which that and all true civil service reform rests, is violated, namely, that merit and not politics should be the criterion for appointment. This principle, and not any statute or collection of statutes, is the true foundation of civil service reform. It is morally wrong knowingly to appoint an unworthy or incapable man to office, because the people are robbed of the amount which an efficient and experienced man in the same position might save them.

Whatever may be said of individuals, the course of the National Civil Service Reform League, which best represents that of the "ardent reformer," has not been hypocritical nor pharisaical, but consistent, courageous, and dignified. Its record of eight years' work speaks for itself. During that time it has stood in the forefront of the battle for political honesty, and has exerted an educational effort for which the country will be duly grateful. As the result of its labors we have on our statute books the so-called Pendleton bill and the well-known laws of Massachusetts and New York, all of which have proved the far-seeing sagacity of their framers.

This letter would be incomplete without an expression of appreciation of the value of Mr. Lodge's services in behalf of civil service reform in the National Congress, and the hope that he may make the country his debtor by action along the line pointed out in his article, namely, extension of the civil service law to the unclassified service.

*William B. Aiken.*

REJOINDER.

DEAR SIR: I have read with much interest Mr. Aiken's open letter which you forward to me before publication. The points which he makes I think can all be answered; and it does not seem to me that we really differ very much in our opinions on the essential principles involved.

*First*, as to Washington's policy. If Washington had merely appointed friends of the Constitution, Mr. Aiken's comments would be perfectly just, and I should be the first to admit it. But while Washington at the outset appointed friends of the Constitution exclusively, as was wise and proper, after the development of parties, and after he had been himself the subject of party attack, he took the ground that only friends of the Government—that is, Federalists—ought to be appointed to office. In September, 1795, he wrote to Pickering:

I shall not, whilst I have the honor to administer the Government, bring a man into any office of consequence knowingly whose political tenets are adverse to the measures which the General Government are pursuing; for this, in my opinion, is a sort of political suicide. That it would embarrass its movements is certain.

Andrew Jackson's change, profound as it was, was a change in degree and not in kind, a change of practice and not of principle, although it undoubtedly had many of the results which Mr. Aiken indicates.

*Secondly*. When I said that some civil service reformers took what I considered an erroneous historical view, I wrote with two able articles before me by a leading civil service reformer, in which the precise view that I thought mistaken was advanced. I did not criticize the articles by name nor cite the authority, because the writer is laboring just as conscientiously as

myself or any one else in this work, and I dislike nothing so much as to criticize, on a comparatively unimportant point, men who are doing good work in which I believe. I have seen the same view taken elsewhere many times, although I am quite aware that it is not the view of all civil service reformers by any means.

*Thirdly*. In what I said about the loud cry against each administration, "that the spirit of the reform is not respected" in regard to those offices which are confessedly filled by patronage, I made the statement general because I wished above all things to avoid any party comparisons. The question is not a party question. I do not think that there has been any essential difference in the actual manner in which patronage offices have been dealt with by administrations of either party, and I think we waste our strength by assailing administrations in regard to the use of patronage in patronage offices. The question of good or bad appointments in patronage offices is something wholly distinct from civil service reform. Civil service reform, as I look at it, is simply the attempt to replace a bad system with a better, and my experience leads me to believe that this can be accomplished best by legislation rather than by partizan recrimination. The point I desired especially to press was that the civil service reformers as such should apply the same standard of criticism to both parties, whether the party in power was the one with which they were in general sympathy or not. I do not think that they have done this.

I trust you will permit me to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Aiken, not only for the pleasant way in which he has discussed my article, but also for his extremely kind expressions in regard to myself, which I entirely appreciate.

*H. C. Lodge.*

**The Women who do the Work.**

WORKING GIRLS' CLUBS.

AT the convention of Working Girls' Societies held in New York last spring, to which delegates and papers were sent from all parts of this country, there was much that was valuable said and read, much that wise and patient experience gave to new workers in the field; but most of it was in regard to the practical workings of the societies and their influence on the girls themselves, and but little of it went back to the qualifications of the teacher and organizer, or her relations with the girls—and yet this is an important side of the question, and one that has great influence on the results we all hope to attain.

One of the most noticeable things about the work is the great difference among the workers, a difference not only of opinion but of atmosphere, intention, and personality; and it is personality, I think, which is the weightiest factor, and which makes success or failure. Good as the general work may be, intelligent as are the lines upon which it is carried on, faithful as are the workers, it is the personal force which in nine cases out of ten fits the keystone in the arch, binds the girls together, and makes the club a success; and, one may add, it is the giving of that personal force which so often breaks down the worker in the end. It is this, and not the literal amount of time and labor and wisdom given, although they too must play their part—this personal element which in theory is so ignored.

The clubs need workers, need ladies to help carry on and extend the work; there is room now for any number of women: ten, twenty, or a hundred can have their hands filled with work if they will come forward and stretch them out to us and help us try to make life happier and more full of meaning and freer from temptation for the girls and women who have to work for their living in our great stores and factories. Not to raise up those who fall,—that task is for others,—but to help the weak-hearted and the strong-hearted to bear more joyfully the burden of life amid difficulties and temptations which would daunt the bravest and the strongest.

We want the best you can give us; we want women who come to the work *con amore*, not merely to do the orthodox modicum demanded now by society from all unmarried or childless women—and we don't want *only* the women who have nothing else to do. For centuries these women have been a standing protest against that truly masculine proverb that "Satan finds some mischief still for idle hands to do,"—unless their struggle against the results of other people's sins can be so interpreted,—and philanthropy has almost come to be considered their exclusive possession. Now this is neither just nor expedient, for there is much work that can be done only by women who are more in touch with the affairs of life. It was well said of Sister Dora by a distinguished man of letters that she possessed three of the most important qualifications for her work—"great personal beauty, fine health, and a keen sense of humor." You will say at once that these are qualities which would fit a woman for success in any sphere of life; and that is just the point I wish to make—that we need the best you can give us, and that it is not only to the women who can devote their energies exclusively to the work, but also to the society belle, the clever writer, the crack lawn-tennis player, and the happy daughter, that we turn. And to the friends and relatives who throw so many obstacles in the way of the worker, and who lay on the shoulders of the club every pale face they see, let us say, What protest did you make when your child laid her young health on the altar of fashionable late hours and wore out her beauty in the incessant pursuit of pleasure? Did you not rather smile with pride to think how sought after she was? Surely you need not grudge the one night a week she gives to her work down town. The clubs keep no late hours.

The working girls want more than classes and club-rooms—they want inspiration and sympathy; often an individual inspiration and sympathy to fit their individual needs. The best that we can give them is our best morally and mentally, the results of our most earnest prayer and practice, of our clearest and hardest thinking. The influence on the worker is perhaps one of the best results of the work,—although it may not be an sensible end in view,—for one cannot with honesty, nor indeed with any comfort to one's self, lead a life outside the club willfully inconsistent with the light in which one appears to the girls; for never mind how little we desire to be looked upon as examples, we are looked upon as such even by the girls with whom we have least personal contact, and we are apt to find that their belief in us and constant reference to us is a pretty sharp reminder of our own shortcomings, even in such minor matters as untidy bureau drawers and buttonless boots, not to speak of the graver questions of living

which are continually raised and whose solution is complicated by the real differences of position and education.

There are two kindred questions about which there has been and still is much controversy, and, I think, many serious mistakes made—first, in underestimating the intelligence of the girls, particularly in practical matters, in which it is apt to be far greater than our own; and secondly, in belittling our advantages in order to conciliate their prejudices. In many cases these prejudices do not exist, and even when they do the differences in our position and education are sure to come to the front sooner or later, and by frankly recognizing them in the beginning as an advantage we prevent their being regarded later on as a barrier. The girls are sure to end by knowing that we keep servants, wear evening dresses, and go to the opera; and by plainly speaking of these things when necessary (the necessity will be rare), as comforts won for us by our husbands' or our fathers' intelligence and labor, we make the distinction in our ways of living more one of degree than one of kind. When once recognized the truth will make our relations with the girls of more value than when it existed on an ignorant or mistaken foundation.

The very leisure and knowledge we are able to put at their disposal comes from this difference of conditions, and it is shirking our responsibility as women of a leisure class when we attempt to pretend that our conditions of life are the same as theirs. The newspapers in this country are successful in giving the working classes a false idea of the occupations and pleasures of the "upper classes." They represent them in all their most sensational and regrettable moments, and but little record is made of the majority of well-to-do and educated people with whom plain living and high thinking has not come to be a dead letter. In our most natural and laudable efforts not to patronize the girls we are apt to forget that we are foregoing the natural advantages of our birthrights in attempting to appear to them as anomalous women from nowhere, instead of ladies whose life and education in perhaps wealthy homes has inspired us with the desire to share what we consider our real advantages with our less fortunate sisters.

It is a great pleasure, this club work—work which any woman with a warm heart will find repaying. Much has been said, but it would be difficult to say enough of the gratitude and responsiveness of the girls to any effort made in their behalf. No one who has not had the experience can realize the pleasure and stimulus of being looked up to and followed, however undeservedly, by a clubful of hard-working girls. The labor is great but the rewards are infinitely greater, and there are not many of us, I fancy, who would not tell you that they had gained vastly more than they had given.

*Florence Lockwood.*

#### Two Monuments.

ON the western coast of North America, upon one of the hills of San Francisco, overlooking the great Pacific Ocean and within one mile of its shore, in Laurel Hill Cemetery, there is a beautiful marble monument, some fifteen feet in height, with a round pillar of graceful proportions encircled with a garland of convolvuli and other flowers, the whole surmounted by a draped vase with a wreath of drooping roses and chrysanthemums.

This is an emperor's tribute to an American citizen, as the following inscription indicates :

THIS MONUMENT was erected by authority of HIS IMPERIAL JAPANESE MAJESTY, to commemorate the high respect and esteem in which MATTHEW SCOTT was held by the JAPANESE GOVERNMENT, and its appreciation of his valuable services at Hiogo from 1872 to 1879.

Far away, in an almost direct westerly line, over six thousand miles distant, near the coast of Asia, and with only the ocean billows of the Pacific rolling between, on the little Japanese island of Tanegashima there has recently been erected another monument by the humble fishermen and villagers, "to commemorate the goodness of the United States," as evinced by the manner in which the American Government has shown its appreciation of the kind and hospitable treatment by the people of the island towards some shipwrecked American sailors who had been cast upon their shore a few years ago.

The full Japanese inscription on this monument was sent by Governor Watanabe, of the great prefecture of Kagoshima, to Mr. Kawagita, the Japanese consul at San Francisco, and by him translated as follows :

MONUMENT TO COMMEMORATE THE GOODNESS OF  
THE UNITED STATES.

In September, 1885, an American vessel was wrecked off the island of Tanegashima, and the whole of the crew perished with the exception of twelve men. Of these, seven persons entered the one remaining boat, and the other five a raft constructed, and after several days of suffering effected a landing on Tanegashima and wandered about almost exhausted by hunger and thirst. Seven of them went to the village of Akimura on Tanegashima, and were succored by Mr. Iwatsbo, an inhabitant of that place, while the remaining five, having separated from their comrades, wandered about during the night near the village of Sekimura, another village of Tanegashima, calling for help. Fortunately Mr. Furuda, a resident of this place, being out fishing, heard their cries, and took the sufferers into his own home.

In the mean time all the inhabitants of these villages, hearing of this unfortunate event, promptly gave food and clothing and every possible assistance to the shipwrecked sailors, by which means they were restored to their usual strength. After this they were accompanied by the village officers to Kagoshima, the capital of Kagoshima Prefecture, and from there they were returned to their own country.

The Government of the United States, being grateful for the kind treatment shown by the villagers towards these American sailors, awarded gold medals to Messrs. Iwatsbo and Furuda, and a sum of money to each rescuer; and further, in March, 1889, with the approval of Congress, the said Government sent through our Foreign Department the sum of \$5000 as a reward to all the people of the two mentioned villages.

Our Government transmitted this money to Mr. Watanabe, the Governor of Kagoshima Prefecture, and by him it was sent to Mr. Omodaka, the chief magistrate of the district of Kumaje.

Upon the receipt of the said \$5000, the latter magistrate, after holding a careful consultation with the people of the villages, bought the Japanese Government bonds known as the Consolidated funds, and divided them between the schools of Sekimura and Akimura, the interest upon the same to be appropriated towards the annual educational expenditures.

This wise action of the magistrate thus provides for the perpetual education of our posterity, and at the same time immortalizes the goodness of the United States Government.

Therefore we, the people of these villages, acting in harmony, erect this monument and inscribe thereon all these facts, together with the following verse, which we dedicate to posterity in immortal commemoration of the goodness of the United States Government :

The principle of loving our neighbor  
Is a very important matter.  
Our Emperor made this Golden Rule;  
We act in accordance with it.  
We must help each other in calamity,  
For sympathy is the law of nature.  
Our act was humble, but its reward was great.  
So, perceiving the spirit of the Giver,  
We accept this gift forever  
And dedicate it to the education of our children.

The original inscription was composed by a man of great learning, and in any translation the sweetness of the sentiment and rhythm is lost. There are ten lines rhymed, and the above is the literal translation.

Of the five that were on that frail raft one was a poor little orphan boy, the son of the dead captain, who, with all the other officers, had perished in the dreadful cyclone; these five were exhausted by starvation and suffering, having been several days on the dismantled vessel with only raw yams to eat and a slender allowance of vinegar to drink; they had left the wreck while many miles distant from the coast, and after floating on the open sea for two days and one night, constantly struggling towards the shore, at last, on the second evening, managed with great difficulty to make their way through the breakers, and finally effected a landing.

They were worn out by their exertions and were famishing from hunger and thirst. Even *indifference* on the part of the natives would have been fatal to them; but the rough sailors grew eloquent over the statement that the kind-hearted islanders seemed to strive with one another as to who should do the most for them. How they fared afterward is told by the inscription and the sailors' narrative.

One of the monuments was erected by the ruler of an empire to a republican citizen; the other, by the subjects of that monarch to the Republic itself.

There is no ocean cable binding the two countries together, and there is a vast distance between them; but from the monuments themselves an unseen chord of sympathy draws the hearts of both nations towards each other!

Horace F. Cutter.

What of the Desert?

THE Great Plains, extending eastward from the Rocky Mountains, comprising some 300,000,000 acres of land, which may properly be classed as arid and semi-arid, present some stupendous economic problems. The region is noted for its deep soil,—a tertiary marl,—which has proved very productive when supplied with sufficient moisture. It has a healthful climate, a moderate elevation, bracing airs, and sunny skies, conducive to a high development of mental and physical energy and vital force. The growth of vegetation, when moisture is sufficient, is rapid, luxuriant, and fruitful. The annual rainfall, however, though occasionally for a single season or series of two or three seasons apparently ample for farming purposes well towards the mountains, is so scanty, or so unfavorably distributed, during other periods, that the effects are felt far to the eastward. Thus there is a broad zone of lands readily accessible to settlement, and constantly tempting land seekers by many palpable advantages, but upon which the uncertainty of success in agriculture increases steadily from east to west.

Were no other solution possible, if the limits of aridity, semi-aridity, and humidity of climate upon the Plains could be ascertained and made apparent, a most serious problem might thus be solved. No one ventures beyond the Rocky Mountains, for example, to attempt a settlement without having ascertained with careful definiteness the conditions surrounding his chosen locality, and being assured that they are such as to offer reasonable assurance of success. The great mountain range is a boundary, a barrier, and a warning. But who can mark the wavering, shifting, eastward limit of the Great American Desert, which may be found now at the foot of the Rocky Mountains, and again at the Missouri River? Where upon the Plains is the line beyond which the westward march of development and improvement may not safely proceed? When ascertained, how shall the limit be made conspicuous and convincing?

The westward press of population, and the rapid decrease of the area of lands available for settlement, long since began to cause attempts at home-making upon the Plains. Again and again has a flood-tide of immigration covered the uncertain zone where humidity and aridity overlap, only to recede—though not completely—after vast expenditure of toil and effort. It would doubtless be a conservative estimate that the whole Plains area has been thrice thus settled and depopulated, the settlers being, as a rule, people of small means, who came from more or less remote localities. The aggregate of the loss and suffering resulting from these unsuccessful efforts at settlement must be almost wholly unappreciated by those who have not personally experienced something of them. People of the East have been called upon at times to relieve the necessities of the inhabitants of a district here and there, but these are only a drop in the bucket. Little is heard or known of the heroic struggles and the privations of those who manage to “hold on somehow” without asking or receiving aid, nor of the vast numbers of families, drifting back to mingle with the population of the older States, a poverty-stricken, shifting, semi-dependent class.

And, notwithstanding the dismal experiences of those who have thus begun the reclamation of the Desert, were present conditions to continue, the growing desire and need for land must still make of the semi-arid belt an enormous absorbent of wealth and energy.

Whether this great area, possessing so many natural advantages, and lacking so few, can be made a safe agricultural region, and, if so, to what extent and by what means, are questions which must concern every inhabitant of the United States. No interest, no class of people, can be indifferent to the question whether there shall be a “famine region” stretching across midway and embracing one-seventh of the area of the nation, or, in its stead, a region of wealth and of dense population. That it may be the latter can scarcely be doubted when the facts concerning it are understood.

The means by which so desirable an end may be accomplished may be summed up in the one word, irrigation; yet there is so much comprised in and connected with the term that volumes would be required to set forth fully all its significance as applied to the Plains. It has been estimated that of the arid lands

of the United States about twenty-five per cent. may be ultimately reclaimed by irrigation. So far as the Plains region is concerned, this estimate may be quadrupled, it being understood that “all” in this connection must be taken in the same sense in which all of any Eastern or Central State may be said to be arable. There are always highways and fallow fields, pasture lands, rough, broken, and waste lands to be counted out. It is only intended to assert that the body and mass of the Plains may be made susceptible of profitable agricultural use so far as moisture is concerned.

This conclusion is drawn from the long and careful consideration of certain facts which, while voluminous in detail, may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. The great retentiveness of moisture which characterizes the marly soil of the Plains.

Under thorough surface cultivation, or any other means of guarding against excessive evaporation, caused by the heat of the sun and the impact of drying winds, a comparatively small amount of moisture produces very satisfactory results.

2. The fact that the annual rainfall approaches so nearly to sufficiency.

More than four-fifths of the yearly precipitation falls between April 1 and September 1, giving the five principal “growing months” an average which, if continued throughout the year, would produce an annual rainfall exceeding that of Illinois. The early and late rains are usually ample; but there is invariably a period of hot, dry weather, averaging two weeks in duration, occurring in midsummer, when small grain is filling and corn tasseling—in fact, just at the time when nearly all crops are at the most critical stage, and when the unrelieved heat and dryness blight the whole. This period provided with the means of irrigation, at least four-fifths of the Plains country would be safe agricultural land.

3. The demonstrated fact that there are vast stores of recoverable underground waters underlying and underflowing the entire Plains region.

This is far the most important factor of all, its magnitude and importance only beginning to be realized.

The means by which the desired reclamation may be brought about may be classified as follows:

1. The recovery of subterranean waters by gravity, by mechanical means (employing animal power, wind, steam, electricity), and by artesian wells.

2. The storage and conservation of surface and other waters.

3. The greatest economy in the use of water.

The last involves the gradual increase of the duty of water (*a*) by experience in its use in irrigation; (*b*) by the adoption of the most economical methods, as, for instance, sub-irrigation; (*c*) by growing, largely, crops adapted to the economy of moisture; (*d*) by increased thoroughness of cultivation; (*e*) by the gradual saturation of the soil; and (*f*) by the increasing protection against the drying influence of sun and wind afforded by timber, orchards, crops, etc.

A matter of incalculable importance, the value of which has been strikingly demonstrated, but is not as highly estimated as it deserves, is the prevention of sweeping prairie fires, which denude, desiccate, and harden the surface of the ground. Where these have been successfully guarded against for a number of years the short grass of the Plains has thickened its growth

many fold, and blue-stem and bunch grasses and other tall-growing vegetation have spread with marvelous rapidity. This thickened and higher growth catches and holds both snow and rain, retards evaporation, aids in the formation of dew, tempers the heat, mellows the soil, and, in fact, exerts a powerful, pervading, and always increasing influence towards redeeming the arid lands.

*J. W. Gregory.*

#### Two Interviews with Robert E. Lee.

I MET General Lee first at his residence in Franklin street, Richmond, in 1861. His face was cleanly shaven except a very full black mustache. He was tall and slender and erect, and reminded me of a French officer of the highest type. I thought him then the most imposing man I had ever seen. Before giving the interview I would like to give a little of my own history which led up to it.

I was on the college campus at Hampden Sidney, Virginia, in May, 1861, with a number of the students at play, when President Atkinson, who had just returned from Farmville, rode up and said, "Young gentlemen, Northern troops have crossed the Potomac into Virginia at Alexandria. Ellsworth's Zouaves tore down the Virginia flag on Jackson's Hotel. Jackson shot Ellsworth and the Zouaves have killed Jackson—the war has begun." The boys raised, and I heard for the first time, the "Rebel yell." It was arranged that afternoon that the students of the college and theological seminary should form a company with Dr. Atkinson as captain.

No one who was there can ever forget the fiery enthusiasm of those boys and of the girls on College Hill, for the girls were worse than the boys. Woe to the boy who did not thirst to die on the bloody field! Little chance would he have stood with one of those girls.

The company was ordered first to Richmond, and soon after, with Colonel John Pegram, to Rich Mountain in the wilds of West Virginia. At Rich Mountain we were attacked by General McClellan in front and by General Rosecrans in the rear, and after a severe engagement the Hampden Sidney boys were surrendered by Colonel Pegram to General McClellan, who treated them very kindly, paroled them, and told them to go back to college and finish their studies.

I, however, made my escape without being paroled. I was sick when the surrender took place. The next day typhoid fever set in and I was sent to a private house. Here I met a Federal sergeant who engaged for fifty dollars in gold, in advance, to take me out of the lines. Before day the next morning he was at the house, and, taking me in his arms, laid me in the bottom of his wagon and covered me with hay. He then drove to the outer picket post, where there was great excitement and anger, owing to the fact that two of their men had just been shot by "bushwhackers." As we drove up they were breathing out threatenings and slaughter against Rebels. One of them jumped up on the front seat and asked the sergeant where he was going. He said, "Foraging." What he had in his wagon. He said, "Nothing." After a few pleasant words the sergeant said he must go on. He then drove over into the woods, and, taking me in his arms, laid me down, expressing the greatest regret at leaving me there in the woods "to die." Cutting off

one of my buttons as a memento, and kissing me on the cheek, he drove away. The thought of escape and freedom was far superior to disease. I sat up—stood—walked—leaped for joy—came up with a Confederate wagon, took the cars at Staunton, and reached Manassas in time to witness the close of the first battle of Bull Run.

After I had served for some time in Mosby's independent command, known to the Federals as "guerrillas," I was offered the adjutancy of a regularly organized regiment. The question then arose whether, as my company was paroled, I had a right to go into service before it was exchanged. This question was referred to General R. E. Lee, whom I sought in Richmond. It was on Sunday morning. General Lee was alone in his parlor. When I was stating my case he interrupted me by saying that this seemed to be a matter of business: "It is my rule never to transact matters of business on the Lord's day, except in cases of necessity or mercy." I told him that I had to leave the city next morning at six o'clock, and he then allowed me to proceed. Though I had been received in a kindly and courteous manner, yet I felt all the time that General Lee was preoccupied. Now and then he seemed engaged in deep thought. When I had stated my case he directed me to repeat it, saying that he had not been listening to me. This I refused to do, expressing regret that I had intruded upon him in a matter that was largely personal, and rose to leave.

As I reached the door General Lee asked me my name, saying that he had not heard it when I was introduced. I told him, and he said he knew my family very well. He then insisted that I should dine with him, saying that he would like very much to have me. I was nothing but a boy, and declined; but I was very much ashamed of myself afterward for being annoyed at his inattention, when he told me that he had just received the intelligence that the enemy had landed in force under General McClellan on the Peninsula.

He then said that I could not be held technically—that the enemy did not have my name as a prisoner of war on parole of honor; "but they were kind to you in sending you to a private house on account of your sickness, and if I were in your place I should consider myself in honor bound to observe the parole until the company is exchanged."

The last two years of the war I spent at General Lee's headquarters as captain of a company of scouts, guides, and couriers in his body-guard, and in all that I had the privilege of seeing of him during those years the two things that impressed me most in this first interview—his high sense of honor, and his deep, though intelligent Christian sentiment—shone conspicuously.

The last time I saw General Lee was in 1865. The curtain had fallen, forever shutting out from our view, I trust, the bloody tragedy of fratricidal war. Satisfied that a surrender was inevitable, I had taken my command out and was on the James River, near Cartersville, in Cumberland County. Here was held a council of war—over which, I think, General Rosser presided.

General Lee had surrendered, but a very large portion of General Lee's army had escaped. What course should we pursue? One proposition before the council was to reorganize as far as possible and form a



junction with Johnston in North Carolina, or, failing in this, to join E. Kirby Smith in the Trans-Mississippi department. A larger number advocated our retiring to the mountains and woods, and carrying on a guerrilla warfare all over the country until we could again bring our armies into the field. The first proposition was objected to as under the circumstances impracticable, if not impossible; the second on the ground that although it would necessitate a large standing army on the part of the North, yet it would inflict untold horrors and suffering upon the South. Still it was the favored plan of operations. The discussion was long, earnest, and stormy, and the council, failing to agree, adjourned in the hope of obtaining more light, and especially that it might get some word from General Lee, who, it was reported, had not been required to take the parole.

The next day I learned that General Lee was being escorted out of the Federal lines by about seventy-five cavalymen. I skirted them for some distance until at length the escort returned, leaving General Lee and his personal staff, with General "Rooney" Lee, his son, and several others to pursue their way to Richmond unattended. The general was riding upon his famous old war-horse "Traveler." No one would ever have known from his looks that General Lee was not returning from one of his great victories. In physique he seemed much larger than in 1861. He now wore a full beard, which, with his hair, had turned gray. Yet there was not a wrinkle in his face and his form was as erect as when I first saw him, and in every respect he still looked the superb soldier. At this time General Lee was fifty-eight years old.

As I approached him and told him of the council and the propositions, and that we were as sheep not having a shepherd, in unapproachable dignity he answered, "I am on parole of honor; but I do not believe that I would be violating the spirit of that parole if I should say, 'Go to your homes, take off your uniforms, and return to the peaceful vocations of life.'"

These words were at once taken down and reported. With many fiery and disappointed and desperate spirits they were the occasion of General Lee's being denounced as a traitor to the South. But in the sober second thought his advice became omnipotent.

Thus both his peaceful words and his example after the surrender gained as great a victory over the heart of the South as had his sword many a time over the enemy on the field of battle. And it is little known to-day at the North how much of blood and treasure was saved to the whole country, after he had laid down his arms, by the influence of General R. E. Lee.

W. W. Page.

#### Washington and Talleyrand.

MR. REID'S prefatory paper to the Talleyrand "Memoirs" says, "Washington refused to receive him [Talleyrand] in America," while at page 375 it is said, "Washington flatly refused to receive him, and Talleyrand never forgot or forgave it." These statements do not seem to me to carry a correct idea of the situation. Washington was then at the head of the Government; grave questions of international and constitutional law had already grown out of the effort made by Washington's administration to maintain a strict and honest neutrality, while events in Europe, awakening sym-

pathy for France and coolness at least towards other people, added to the difficulties. Talleyrand came here a French refugee, expelled from England, but then a man of importance in any view taken of his career.

The Marquis of Lansdowne gave Talleyrand a letter to Washington (see "Life of Earl Shelburne," Vol. III., p. 515). Lansdowne was at this time acting with Fox, and against the Pitt administration. It goes without saying that a President as cautious as Washington might well hesitate when requested to receive such an eminent refugee from two countries—countries with which our relations were then greatly strained.

Washington replied to Lansdowne's letter as follows:

30TH AUGUST, 1794.

MY LORD: I had the pleasure to receive the introduction from your lordship delivered to me by M. de Talleyrand-Perigord. I regret very much that considerations of a political nature, and which you will easily understand, have not permitted me as yet to testify all the esteem I entertain for his personal character and your recommendation.

I hear that the general reception he has met with is such as to console him, as far as the state of our society will permit, for what he abandoned on leaving Europe. Time will naturally be favorable to him wherever he may be, and one must believe that it will elevate a man of his talents and merit above the transitory disadvantages which result from differences as to politics in revolutionary times.

WASHINGTON.

I quote the above from the essay of Sir Henry Bulwer on Talleyrand, which Mr. Reid also refers to in his prefatory article.

As the publication of the "Memoirs" proceeds we may ascertain to what extent it is true even that Talleyrand "never forgot or forgave" in this particular instance. At least this is true, that under the circumstances then existing President Washington adopted the wise course, and I cannot think that Talleyrand—called by Bulwer (one of the greatest of diplomats) "The Politic Man"—felt that he had a right to complain, or that he could properly treasure up anything against one of the most courteous and courtly of men.

Washington declined to receive other French refugees, on the grounds suggested above, and there existed no sound reason why a distinction should be made in Talleyrand's favor.

Cephas Brainerd.

NEW YORK CITY.

#### Madame de Rémusat on Talleyrand and Bonaparte.

THE following passage from the memoirs of Madame de Rémusat is particularly apropos of the present instalment of the Talleyrand Memoirs: "A most fatal indifference to good and evil, right and wrong, formed the basis of M. de Talleyrand's nature; but we must do him the justice to admit that he never sought to make a principle of what was immoral. He is aware of the worth of high principle in others; he praises it, holds it in esteem, and never seeks to corrupt it. It appears to me that he even dwells on it with pleasure. He has not, like Bonaparte, the fatal idea that virtue has no existence, and that the appearance of it is only a trick or an affectation the more. I have often heard him praise actions which were a severe criticism on his own. His conversation is never immoral or irreligious; he respects good priests, and applauds them; there is in his heart both goodness and justice; but he does not apply to himself the rule by which he judges others."

## TOPICS OF THE TIME.

### A "Cheap Money" Lesson from History.

THE desire for "cheap money," under the delusion that plenty of it will make everybody's life easier and his burdens lighter, is very many years old. Nothing is more interesting and instructive in the study of financial history than the almost constant recurrence of the same fallacies and popular crazes in different countries during the past three hundred years or more. The prophets of new panaceas of to-day are simply preaching the half-truths and misleading sophistries of similar prophets in various lands at almost any time since the close of the seventeenth century. They have all started from the same general point; that is, dissatisfaction with established financial methods and the assumption that the moneyed classes, the bankers and capitalists, are the enemies and oppressors of the poorer classes.

There are many illustrations to support these observations which we might cite from history, but none which bears more directly upon certain aspects of our financial experience as a nation than that of the famous Land Bank scheme, put forward in England in the reign of William and Mary, in 1693. It appeared amid a swarm of other financial plans which were broached in the English Parliament when the proposition to establish the Bank of England was under consideration. There were in existence at that time two great public banks renowned throughout Europe, the Bank of St. George at Genoa, and the Bank of Amsterdam. The former had existed for nearly three hundred years, and the latter for more than eighty, and both had demonstrated many times their ability to withstand the severest financial crises. England felt the need of a similar financial bulwark, and its establishment was decreed in 1694, when the act of foundation for the Bank of England was passed by Parliament. While that act was under consideration, one Hugh Chamberlain, who had fitted himself for the solving of financial problems by practising medicine, came forward with a scheme for a Land Bank. The peculiarity of this bank was that its currency was to consist solely of notes issued in unlimited quantities upon landed security. Every person who had real property was to be allowed to hold the land and at the same time receive an issue of paper money to its full value. Thus, says Macaulay in his picturesque account of the scheme, if a man's "estate was worth two thousand pounds, he ought to have his estate and two thousand pounds in paper money." But this was not all. He ought also to be allowed to rate the value of his estate at as many times its annual income as the number of years for which it was pledged. Thus if its income was a thousand dollars, a grant of it for twenty years must be worth \$20,000 in paper money, and that for one hundred years \$100,000. Everybody who opposed this remarkable form of reasoning was denounced as a "usurer." In laying his plan before Parliament, Chamberlain undertook to raise eight thousand pounds upon every freehold estate of one hundred

and fifty pounds a year, which would be brought into his bank without dispossessing the freeholder. The plan was considered in committee and was reported favorably to the House, the committee declaring that it was practicable and would tend to benefit the nation; but the report was never acted upon.

The scheme was revived in 1696, but in a somewhat less ridiculous form. Chamberlain was forced, under protest, to abandon his idea that a lease of land for a term of years was worth many times the fee simple, and to be content with a bank which lent money on landed security to the full value of the land. He offered also to lend the Government, in return for the Land Bank's charter, more than two and a half million pounds at seven per cent. The Bank of England had, in return for its charter, advanced to the Government only one million, at eight per cent. William, being in pressing need of money for his military operations in the Netherlands, welcomed the prospect of such generous aid, and was not disposed to question the source from which it came. The country members were, according to Macaulay, "delighted by the prospect of being able to repair their stables, replenish their cellars, and give portions to their daughters," and at the same time retain possession of their land. A bill was passed authorizing the Government to borrow two million five hundred and sixty-four thousand pounds at seven per cent. If before the 1st of August the subscription for one-half of this loan should have been filled, and one-half of the sum subscribed should have been paid into the exchequer, the subscribers were to become a corporate body under the name of the National Land Bank. As this bank was intended expressly to accommodate country gentlemen, it was forbidden to lend money on any other private security than a mortgage on land, and must lend on such mortgages at least half a million annually, at a rate not to exceed three and a half per cent. if payments were quarterly, or four per cent. if they were half-yearly. The market rate of interest at the time on the best mortgages was full six per cent.

In order to set a good example the king subscribed five thousand pounds just before his departure on his Netherland campaign, and signed a warrant appointing commissioners to receive the names of subscribers. A great meeting was held in behalf of the new bank, rooms were taken in two different parts of London for the receiving of subscriptions, and agents were sent into the country to inform the country gentlemen of the dawn of the new era of prosperity. Three weeks passed after the opening of the subscription books, and it was discovered that only six thousand five hundred pounds, including the king's five thousand, had been subscribed. The 1st of August came, and the whole amount subscribed by the nation in addition to the king's subscription reached only two thousand one hundred pounds. The promoters of the scheme begged the Government for more time, and for a reduction in the amount required to be paid in before

the act of incorporation should be issued; and the Government, being in great stress for funds, conceded that if four hundred thousand pounds were advanced the bank should be incorporated at the next session of Parliament. But concessions were of no avail in stimulating subscriptions. The term of the commission expired, and the offices were closed upon a total collapse of the enterprise.

The causes of this failure are so clear that it is a wonder anybody ever expected a different result. The avowed object of the scheme was to benefit the land owners who wished to borrow money, and to injure the "moneyed men, those worst enemies of the nation." "The fact is," says Professor Thorold Rogers in his luminous account of the affair in his "First Nine Years of the Bank of England," "the landed men hated the moneyed men with a bitterness in which envy, contempt, pride, and religious bigotry were the strongest ingredients. They looked on their growing wealth with envy, on their occupation with scorn, on their birth with disdain, on their creed and discipline with intolerant hate. Now in such a frame of mind such people will believe anything, even such a quack as Chamberlain was — not the first adventurer who has imagined himself a financier." Yet upon these very moneyed men they depended absolutely for the success of their enterprise. As Macaulay says, the "country gentlemen wished well to the scheme; but they wished well to it because they wanted to borrow money on easy terms; and, wanting to borrow, they of course were not able to lend it. The moneyed class alone could supply what was necessary to the existence of the Land Bank; and the Land Bank was avowedly intended to diminish the profits, to destroy the political influences, and to lower the social position of the moneyed class. As the usurers did not choose to take on themselves the expense of putting down usury, the whole plan failed in a manner which, if the aspect of public affairs had been less alarming, would have been exquisitely ridiculous."

There have been within the past year several schemes for the relief and benefit of the farmers of the country which were scarcely more rational than this of the quack of 1693. If any of them were to be embodied in law, it would fail to accomplish the results expected of it, for reasons similar to those which made the failure of the Land Bank scheme so certain. The moneyed class is always in the position to guard itself against the bad effects of disturbing financial legislation, and even to profit by it at the expense of the poorer class. A competent authority upon the subject of farm mortgages declares that ninety per cent. of them are negotiated by systematic lenders, banks, and corporations organized for this express purpose, and that it has been the custom of many of these lenders to make the mortgage debt, both principal and interest, payable in gold. It is believed that fully one-half of all the mortgage indebtedness of the country is in terms expressly payable in gold, though this is more generally the case in urban than in farm loans. If we were to have free silver coinage, and the country were to reach the silver standard, and gold were to rise to one hundred and twenty or thereabouts, mortgagors who are counting upon having their debts reduced by the change would soon discover their error. They would find that they would have to pay one hundred and

twenty dollars in silver for every instalment of one hundred dollars interest in gold. In other words, they, and not the capitalists and money-lenders, would be the losers from this as from every other form of "cheap money."

#### The Effect of Christian Science and Mind-cure on "the Regular Practice."

THE belief in Christian Science and Mind-cure, so widely prevalent, has not only its grave dangers and ill results, but a more advantageous aspect. In so far as a passive superstition attempts to deal with active causes of disease and death, this mental phenomenon is not to be tolerated. Examples are found in the indictments brought against Christian Scientists in several States in cases where death has resulted from palpable neglect of established methods of combating definitely known dangers. In this aspect of the case time only can bring about a radical cure, aided by a strict enforcement of law. There remains, however, a class of afflictions in which the sufferer is not ailing so much in body as in mind, where the problem of cure lies in the answer to the familiar question as to the best methods of "ministering to a mind diseased." Such suffering is very commonly characterized by great mental pain. By mental pain we mean melancholia, nervous prostration, and the vast range of indefinable suffering which results from the disordered activity of the nervous system. It is given to but few to have their perturbations rise to the dignity of "sweet bells jangled, out of tune." Unrest, sleeplessness, anxiety, irritability, such are the common and lesser pains inevitable to nearly all dwellers under highly civilized conditions. The phrase "out of harmony with one's environment" perhaps expresses this condition as well as any other. A cure can obviously not be accomplished by a transient agent. A stimulant may temporarily bring happiness, a narcotic produce sleep, or a change of scene may, for the time being, divert; but so soon as the recently established condition lapses and the original causes begin to act, the first effect is reproduced. Such suffering is acute in proportion as it is realized. Thus a mother caring for a number of small children bears a thousand ills almost unconsciously which the woman living at ease and with only herself to favor esteems the height of misery.

When analyzed closely, it has been found that pain is disordered nervous action not necessarily dependent upon any permanent structural change. The remedy for such conditions lies primarily in a return to something like the normal condition of human existence; a large number of hours spent in contact with the natural and not the artificial world; a reduction of the wants of life and their gratification to somewhat of the simplicity which marks less complex conditions of civilization, and an adjustment of labor performed and energy exercised by the different parts of the human organism resulting in harmonious action and not in discord — such would be an attempt at a radical cure; but this is rarely possible except to the few.

There remains, however, the marvelous power of mind over body, and what is termed in more exact language the inhibitory or commanding action of mind over matter. In this sense the belief that a pain does not exist when that pain is not dependent upon an alteration in the actual structures of the body, but is de-

pendent upon a temporarily disordered nervous action, may be an efficient cure. An amusing example was recently furnished by the child of a Christianly Scientific mother. In playing with other children this little one received a bump, which created temporarily disordered nervous action. True to her mother's teaching, she refused to cry, asserting that she felt no pain, a statement which her effort at self-control rendered questionable: she certainly inhibited or controlled a manifestation of that pain. In a moment, however, she suggested to her playmate that, as there was not candy enough to go around, the playmate should imagine that she was eating candy, when she would have the sweet taste in her mouth. Here the success of the hypothesis ended, and at once a lack of harmony in the playmate's environment arose which resulted in a protest against the paucity of the supply of sweets.

It is a very old observation that a dominant idea is valuable in controlling the human being, and whether it be in the bearing of pain or in the devotion which leads the Turk to die contentedly before the Russian bullets, belief is a factor that may be turned to great advantage. Indirectly, Christian Science may prove an aid to medical science. The intelligent physician of to-day could receive no greater aid in the scientific practice of his profession than to be emancipated by his patients from the obligation invariably to prescribe a drug. When people are willing to employ physicians to order their lives so that they may live in health, the custom which binds the physician to prescribe something for his patient will be unnecessary. As we have become more civilized this state of affairs is gradually coming into place; but there still lingers the expectation that the doctor's visit means drugs. Christian Science and Faith-cure, more refined than the spiritualistic beliefs which have preceded them, form an interesting study in mental pathology, and mark an advance from the grosser stage of table-tipping and magnetic doctors to a recognition of the fact that among the weapons employed by the scientific physician of to-day an appeal to a determined purpose to overcome pain is worthy of a place beside antiseptics and anodynes and tonics.

#### Country Roads.

THERE are few signs that the quite persistent agitation of the question of improving the condition of country roads, which has been in progress for many years, has had an appreciable effect upon the dwellers of our country towns. It may be that in a few isolated instances better and more scientific methods of road-building have been adopted, but in the great majority of towns the old method of scraping the dust and compost from the gutters back again upon the roadway from which travel and the storms of heaven had removed it is the sole form of repair which has been put in practice. The roads are continued thus, in about equally bad condition, throughout the year. They are heavy and even miry in the spring and fall, and dusty and muddy by turns throughout the summer. It is the literal truth that the prevailing method of repairing is the same now as in the early colonial days, when any road was considered good enough for all purposes so long as it had not in it rocks or holes of sufficient size to upset a carriage. As a people we should not have lagged so far behind the nations of the Old World in the art of

road-making if we had not passed so soon from the colonial or frontier stage of settlement into the railroad stage of communication. The advent of the railroad not only threw the post-roads, which were the only lines of communication upon which anything like systematic care was exercised, out of use, but by opening up new regions for settlement they dispersed people over a much wider area, and made the general building of good roads impossible. All roads became simply avenues of approach to the railways, and all were treated with equal neglect.

Appeals have been made many times to the rural population to improve their highways for their own economic benefit, the contention being that a well-made road is the best investment which the inhabitants of a town could make, since it would save them its cost many times over in lessening the wear and tear of vehicles, horses, and oxen, and in economizing time. They could carry heavy loads over it at all seasons of the year with much less strain upon animals and vehicles and far more quickly. It has been estimated by excellent authorities that the present slipshod method of road making and repairing, with its system of "working out the taxes," and the delay and wear and tear, cost each household not less than ten dollars a year. This is far more than the cost of schools, and almost as much as all State and Federal taxes combined. It seems to be impossible, however, to make much impression with arguments of this kind. The country people look at the first cost of the proposed improvement, and refuse to look beyond that to the benefits which the investment would bring.

The great increase in the "summer-boarder industry" during recent years ought to exert a powerful influence in the right direction. That industry has become so important in New England that two governors in that region, those of Maine and New Hampshire, called attention to it in their annual messages last January, and suggested plans for its further development. The governor of New Hampshire estimated the amount of money left in the State during the previous year by summer visitors at \$5,000,000. There are many other States in which this would be a reasonable estimate of the revenue from the same source. The editor of a Vermont newspaper went into particulars upon the value of this industry at the close of the season in August last, and in the course of his analysis said that the presence of one thousand city boarders in a rural country was equivalent to the bringing in of \$100,000 in money to be left in exchange for the products of the inhabitants; that the good effects were felt in every farm in the country, supplying close at home a good market for all its products; and that, taken all together, the "summer-boarder industry leads all others, brings in the most money, and pays the most profit." The same authority went on to say, "But the summer-boarder industry never can be built up if the people go on spoiling the beauty of their roads by cutting away their decorations of shrubs and vines and flowers, which are the very things that the summer boarder comes to see and enjoy." He was dwelling especially upon the esthetic side of the road question, but what he said affords an equally strong argument upon the practical side of it, for there is no surer magnet for the summer boarder than well-made roads which afford pleasant driving at all times.

There is not a rural town within boarding distance of a great city which could not at slight expense assure itself all the city boarders that it could accommodate by the simple process of systematically and intelligently improving and beautifying its roads. If it were to appoint a town committee with power to employ experts, or to obtain expert advice, and to carry out the suggestions thus obtained in road improvement, the mere public advertisement of that proceeding would attract boarders from all directions. The expense would not be great. In nearly every case the gravel or cracked stone necessary for the construction of a serviceable, well-drained road can be obtained within moderate distance. There is, for example, in some parts of Orange County, in New York State, a kind of soft red

sandstone to be found in great abundance, which crushes readily under the wheels and makes a hard, firm road-bed which is never dusty and never muddy, which is yielding to the horses' feet and most agreeable to ride over. Ordinary gravel can be used with almost equally good results. The main thing is to secure something like scientific knowledge in the construction of the road and in the mixture of materials. The vicious idea that anybody can make a road by shoveling dirt into the middle of it from the gutter, or, what is the same thing in a wholesale form, hauling it there by means of a "scraper," must be abandoned at the outset, and not only abandoned but prohibited. Until that is done no reform will be possible.

## OPEN LETTERS.

### A Play and an Actor.

"FRENCH may be sometimes heard spoken in the Rue de la Paix" of the gay capital of France, says Henry James, and, similarly, it may be said that there may sometimes be seen upon the stage something that looks like nature. I am not of that goodly company of graybeards — though for their opinions I entertain the most profound respect — who contend that the drama is in its decadence, and that the actresses of to-day are not the radiant creatures, nor the actors the brilliant geniuses, who made splendid the glad theaters of two generations ago. Two centuries have nearly slipped by since Colley Cibber cried out against the decadence of the drama and indignantly inveighed against the lewd undraped French dancers and posturers who usurped the then "inconstant stage" of England and drove from it its noblest ornaments. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, in 1702, Steele made public protest, in the prologue to his comedy of "The Funeral," against the supremacy on the stage of matter as opposed to mind; of the ascendancy of the carpenter, the costumer, and the property-man, and the power of the mountebank to banish even Shakspeare from the boards. This protest is worthy of reproduction at this time when the outcry comes, as if it were original, against the carpenter's, machinist's, and upholsterer's drama, so called.

Nature's deserted and dramatic art,  
To dazzle now the eye, has left the heart;  
Gay lights and dresses, long-extended scenes,  
Demons and angels moving in machines;  
All that can now or please, or fright the fair,  
May be performed without a writer's care,  
And is the skill of carpenter, not player.  
Old Shakspeare's days could not thus far advance;  
But what 's his buskin to our ladder dance?  
In the mid region a silk youth to stand,  
With that unwieldy engine at command!

The drama has always been, from its birth up, apparently, in a state of decay; the living can easily remember when France denied Christian burial to actors, or when England by formal decree made them vagabonds before the law, and every one is familiar with the old nursery rhyme:

Hark, hark! the dogs do bark,  
The beggars are coming to town,  
Some in rags and some in jags,  
And some in velvet gowns.

But every one, possibly, does not know that the "beggars" therein referred to were the strolling players, though of them there was once the afterward great queen of tragedy, Sarah Siddons, whose portrait Sir Joshua Reynolds painted as the "Muse of Tragedy," and who, reverently painting his name upon the hem of her garment, declared that in being permitted to do so he had achieved fame enough. My authority for saying that Mrs. Siddons was one of the nursery doggerel "beggars" is David Garrick, who, in an unpublished letter to Moody, asks, "Do you know anything of a Mrs. Siddons strolling down your way?" Edmund Kean was another of the motley crew of vagabonds who strolled and starved along England's green lanes or icy roads for years together before he stood the triumphant master of the stage on that bitterly cold and stormy night when, dressed in the gabardine of the Jew, he evoked the plaudits that shook the roof of Drury Lane by his incomparable acting, and by which he saved the fortunes of the house.

I do not believe that the old actors were better or greater than the new. I rather think that they were only different from these, and I am not at all assured that the "sing-song" declamation of Mrs. Siddons, of which Hazlitt makes mention, was as effective as the hurtling words of Bernhardt which are flung straight at the hearts of the audience from her tongue with the force of David's sling, with the directness of the stone, and with effect as startling if not as tragical. Garrick was, no doubt, a great actor, but was his power to subdue an audience to his humor greater than Salvini's in tragedy? It would appear, from all that we know of him, that Garrick was a more accomplished comedian than tragedian. Still, I do not believe that he was the superior of Burton, Burke, Warren, or Jefferson.

I know that the "Clémenceau Case," the "Brass Monkey," and other plays of which they are respectively representative, still hold the stage. I also know that the plays for which the former stand justify all the condemnation of the acted drama which ignorance, begot of prejudice, or wisdom, begot of morality, has thundered against it from pulpit and sanctuary.

At a time when the undraped spectacle, the vapid burlesque, the tainted comedy, the over-wrought melodrama, seem to be most aggressive in their popularity, and at a time when the remaining great old actors of

classic tragedy and elegant comedy only pause awhile to give to the latest generation of playgoers a touch of their fine quality before making their adieus, there appears an actor of such assured talents, and there is produced upon the American stage a class of plays, that confutes and shames the inconsiderate condemners of the theater. Of this wholesome class is "Captain Swift," which is the pitiful story once more, and nobly retold, of the man of ruined blood working out in the direful tragedy of his own life the old Hebraic curse which visited upon the children the sins of the parent. A still better example of this finer sort of play is that of "The Middleman," which was lately seen at Palmer's Theater on Broadway. One such play, as fitly set upon the stage, as fairly acted in its lesser parts, as nobly acted in its greater ones, would be of itself enough to turn the tide of general condemnation, which, like to the Propontis, flows forever on against the entire drama.

Mr. Henry Arthur Jones's play, which is a picture of modern English life, possesses at least the charm of novelty of treatment, if not of striking originality of conception. Something of the plot we have all seen before, and the characters are not all absolutely unfamiliar. Again and again, with greater or lesser change, has the story of "The Middleman" been retold to rapt audiences; again, and yet many times again, have those who are of it a part strutted and fretted their brief hour upon the stage for our pleasure or our pain; but let it be said, as it must be said in truth, it has all been presented to us with a difference.

The plot of "The Middleman" is so originally wrought out to its fit conclusion as to make it seem wholly new: the characters are so strongly, delicately drawn; they are so sentient, of such human sort, as to make them appear as men and women that we have known in the daily ups and downs of this workaday world of ours.

It is a play with a purpose,—a moral, if you will,—which is, the exaltation of achievement. It shows a man beset by all that saps and weakens manhood, one upon whose ruined life disasters "follow fast and follow faster"; but who, despite them all, because of his invincible devotion to and persistence in one great object, which is a creative one, grows in manliness and strength, and whose endeavor is crowned with triumph. The play is a paean chanted to the man who *does* something for the world's betterment—to the man who, bearing down all opposition, achieves the purpose for which, in that simple faith which fails not by the way, he has wrought with marvelous courage and patience through entire decades.

But Mr. Jones's play, admirable as it is, would not attract and hold us as it does were it not for the excellent acting of it. Gilbert and Sullivan fused their genius for letters and music with the happy results of "Pinafore" and "The Mikado"; but in "The Middleman" the author and the actor have combined their talent so firmly, deftly, and harmoniously as to produce the effect of a performance as whole as the marble, and one which for its consistency of design and execution can scarcely be too highly commended.

It is only just to the actor, Mr. E. S. Willard, to say that his genius outruns that of the author. The art of the player is of more original, finer, subtler stuff than that of the playwright; it has the power to evoke sen-

timents and passions from the vasty deep of the entranced fancy, of which the author neither schemed nor dreamed; it creates images of wondrous power and beauty, which become forever fixed upon the mind of the spectator sitting at the play.

As it has been herein suggested, Mr. Willard has to do in this drama with materials not too new, only newly made over. He is a stage father as familiar almost as the stage itself. But he appears before his audience in shape so strange, with power to charm the senses so assured, with genius to beguile the feelings so subtle, as to make it appear as if he were the first of stage fathers whose child was wronged, whose home was desolated, whose heart was broken.

Mr. Willard's entrance upon the stage proclaimed his indisputable right to the center of it; it recalled Kean's original entrance before the floats of Drury Lane when as *Shylock* he leaned upon his crutched stick listening to *Bassanio's* offers of security, and of the conclusive verdict rendered to his neighbor by that great authority of his day, Dr. Arnold: "He will do." Mr. Willard's gaunt, wasted figure; his unconsidered garb; his distraught manner; his introspective look; his unconsciousness of the unfitness of himself to his surroundings; his contempt for things material; his absorption in the single idea that possessed his mind, even as did his love for his daughter possess his heart—all made up a picture of such intense interest as to catch and fix in an instant the eye, the ear, the mind, and the heart of his audience.

Greater actors than Mr. Willard his audiences may have seen, but I doubt if for many years they have seen a more original one. He has, as *Cyrus Bledkarn*, whistled down the wind the most cherished traditions of the theater. At the end of the second act, when he hears of the shame and flight of the child that he has loved with a love greater than that of Rachel for her children; when he hears that she is lost to him, to home, to honor, the old wonted curse of the stage father is anticipated, and not vainly. It follows, of course, but it is as no other stage father's curse ever was. The stricken man, standing amid the ruins of his home, with all that made home precious, sweet, and beautiful, rudely shattered, does not pray God to destroy his enemies, but to give to him the power to do it. He cannot trust the consummation of his vengeance even to the divine arm; his own must strike the blow; he himself must wreak the vengeance.

The author's manner of phrasing the mixed supplication and imprecation, fine as it is, is of little power compared with the actor's manner of pronouncing it. He should, by all the law and custom of the acted drama from *Thespis* to the last melodramatic star, rush madly to the footlights, fall heavily upon his knees, upreach his clasped hands, and, banishing all tones not thunderous, vociferously tear good passion to tatters, splitting the ears of the groundlings and terrifying them with noise.

Mr. Willard does nothing of the kind. He does not approach the footlights; he does not fall upon his knees; he does not vociferate his prayer; but standing erect, in the center of the stage, his thin hands—stained with the clay in which they wrought and in which lies buried the secret for which his mind struggles vainly—outstretched to the farthest limit, he

speaks in a low, measured monotone which is as deep as the nethermost depths of human misery, suffering, and wrong; and, so standing and speaking, he seems as one fit to command from Heaven itself the boon of vengeance for which he supplicates. It has been objected to by some of Mr. Willard's critics that his tone is both too low and too monotonous in this scene; but it is to be considered, we think, by its effect upon the ears, the hearts, of those upon which it falls. I doubt if those who have heard the curse of *Lear* as Booth pronounced it, or of *Richelieu* as Forrest delivered it, were ever more moved by it, though it was sounded in a more heroic key, than were those who heard Mr. Willard's more subdued prayer. No one, I believe, was ever quite certain that *Lear's* or *Richelieu's* curse would have fulfilment, but no one doubted that *Cyrus Blenkarn's* would. The strange figure of "that poor bankrupt there" was clothed with his great wrong in majesty and power so great as to seem to compel the vengeance for which he asked. The man appeared for the moment to the overwrought imagination of the spectator to be himself the awful minister of retributive justice; he seemed to fill the stage, to pervade every part of it. He appeared more than a man, an overpowering image of one on whom sin and sorrow and suffering had laid their hands to dignify, strengthen, and ennoble. He seemed as great as fate itself, and those who heard his supplication knew that it would be answered, that *Cyrus Blenkarn's* enemies would be made even as he prayed they should be, as wax in his hands. It was not the author's words, but the actor's art, that assured to the audience the consummation of his prayer far in advance of its realization.

The great purpose—the moral—of the play is not destroyed, not impaired even, by the man's petition and hope for vengeance upon those who had wrought him such sore hurt. This baser desire of a noble mind was but an episode, a temporary yielding to temptation which vanished when the opportunity to realize it came to *Cyrus Blenkarn*. They who had wrought him ill were subdued, even as he had prayed they should be, to his will; but with all his wrongs and sorrows thick upon him he sat down in the place of wealth and power from which he had displaced them and simply asked, the time having come when he could say, Vengeance is mine, and I will repay, "What would *Mary* do?" He knew what the child that he had so loved, and had for so long mourned as wronged and dead, would do. He knew that, out of her infinite goodness, she would forgive her enemies even as she would be forgiven. So, in tribute to and influenced by his abiding love for her and her power over him still, he also forgave them. He did more. He gave them of his plenty. Then the original great purpose and moral of the play stood unbroken by any lesser, baser one.

At the end of the third act, in the firing-house, when *Cyrus Blenkarn* threw down the wall of the oven and with mad haste and trembling hands, his noble face blanched to the color of the clay, seized the crate of crumbling clay, the actor's look, his low, sharp cry of despair, struck despair to every heart in the theater, and when, a moment later, from among the shattered forms of beauty he plucked the perfect vase, holding with it, in his eager, hungry hands, the recovered secret of the ancient *Tatlow* pottery, dead and

buried a hundred years, and dead and buried forever except for him, his exaltation, his mighty triumph,—for which he had paid down the price of hope a thousand times defeated, of thought, of labor, of the sacrifice of all the golden years of youth and manhood, and of all the things which others do hold more precious than life itself,—was only more pitiful than his previous desperation. The actor did not rave nor shout because he had discovered the secret of the lost art, the discovery of which would make him rich, famous; that would put his enemies as wax into his hands for him to stamp and mar and crush as his long-delayed and ever-increasing vengeance willed him to do. The moment of his triumph was one of those supreme ones in which the overwrought heart finds no relief in words. As the curtain fell upon this marvelously impressive scene *Cyrus Blenkarn* held close to his heart the precious vase which was vital with an art that his genius of patience and labor had restored to the world. A great joy illumined his face, but he said nothing. There were five recalls of the actor on the evening I first saw this scene presented. But the author as well as the actor contributed to its successful ending. The former had provided the body, and the actor had breathed into it the vitalizing breath of his genius, and it so became one of the most sentimentally human scenes of the modern drama.

To the end of the play of "The Middleman" there was no descent from the high plane on which author and actor began it. But it was the greater power of the actor that brought the curtain down upon the last act so effectively. When the daughter that he had so long thought dishonored and dead stood before him, as one risen from the grave, alive, and the happy wife of the man she loved and who loved and honored her, and who had always done so, *Cyrus Blenkarn* stood awed to silence, fearfully bewildered and to reason lost as do those who see spirits walk. And then to see his face change from fear to doubt, from doubt to assurance that it was his living child he saw, and not the ghost of her, and to hear his exultant cry of joy as he flung his arms about and held her close to his old, scarred breast, was to see and hear something worth remembering forever.

We cannot always have actors on the stage of genius or talent like that of Mr. Willard's, but we can, if audiences so will it, have always plays which, like "The Middleman," elevate, not debase, the stage. "The Clémenceau Case" survives only by the sufferance of audiences, and the lovers of the drama have but to turn their backs upon that play and all of its kind to banish them from before the floats. The theater is one of the greatest of teachers. Why should it not be one of the best?

L. Clarke Davis.

#### The Discoveries of Pasteur, Koch, and Others.

A BRIEF REVIEW TO DATE.

THE subject of microbes and bacteriology has been often discussed before lay audiences. However abstruse the researches which have opened up the modern field of knowledge in this direction, however subtle the technique by which these researches are controlled and prosecuted, the fundamental facts of the subject are easily explained, because they are easily assimilated to those of everyday observation.

Microbes are plants of microscopic minuteness, consisting each of a single cell so small that many thousands must be placed end to end to traverse the diameter of a pin's head. These plants produce spores, exactly analogous to the seeds of visible plants, like those disseminated in the air, or clinging to solid substances, capable of maintaining their vitality for an indefinite time, and ready to grow and reproduce their kind whenever they can find a suitable soil upon which to implant themselves.

It is in the nature of this suitable soil, in the mode and consequences of the growth and reproduction of microbes, that this class of cryptogamic plants distinguish themselves in the most important way from the ordinary denizens of the woods and fields. Like other plants, microbes require oxygen for their development. But instead of appropriating oxygen from the air, they withdraw it from the molecules of organic matter in which they may find themselves embedded. The organic molecule therefore tumbles to pieces, as a wall falls down when bricks are taken out of the middle of it. In other words, the organic matter is decomposed by the intramolecular respiration of the microbes, and new substances are formed from the rearrangement of such molecules as remain.

It is in this way, as Pasteur proved in 1857, that the yeast plant causes the fermentation of beer and bread and wine. Plunged below the surface of the dough or liquid, thus withdrawn from immediate contact with the air, the yeast withdraws oxygen from the sugar of the barley or grape juice, or from the starch of the flour. Part of the oxygen is absorbed into the substance of the yeast plant, which, thus nourished, buds with inconceivable rapidity. The remaining atoms of oxygen unite with the carbon and hydrogen atoms in different proportions to form alcohol, carbonic acid, and glycerin. Thus the process of fermentation, which, in its entirety, had been known from the dawn of history, and in modern times had been explained by chemical theories, was now for the first time made clear, and shown to be an incident in the life history of a microscopic plant, and dependent upon its nutrition — upon its "intramolecular respiration."

That yeast consisted of microscopic cells was proved in 1680 by Leuwenhoek, the improver of the microscope. That these cells were plants, which breathed and grew by budding, was shown by Cagniard de la Tour in 1836; and in 1837 Schwann discovered numerous organic germs in the air, and associated with processes of fermentation and putrefaction. But it was the brilliant researches of Pasteur that first thoroughly explained the mechanism of the relations between fermentation and the vital processes of micro-organisms. From their date the yeast plant, which first enters history — and most dramatically — as the leaven which the Israelites did *not* have when they escaped out of Egypt, has become immortalized as the type of a class of living beings whose importance seems proportioned to their incredible minuteness and their potency to their invisibility.

The association of these micro-organisms with disease was established almost simultaneously with that of their relations to fermentation, and low and humble was the door which opened to research the magnificent field of inquiry now being everywhere prosecuted with such restless activity. It was on the body of the silk-

worm that the first pathogenic organisms were found — by Bassi — in the disease known as the muscardine. Afterward the potato blight and other vegetable diseases were similarly shown to depend on the invasion of microscopic fungi, entering into a struggle for existence with their hosts. Analogous fungi were found in several skin diseases affecting human beings, and finally, in 1853, Davaine discovered little rod-shaped bodies swarming in the blood of patients suffering from splenic fever. Inoculations of animals with a drop of such blood sufficed to produce the disease in them, and a drop of their blood in turn originated the disease, and so on, until by successive generations the original infecting drop might be considered reduced to the trillionth dilution and beyond. The virulence even increased with each new inoculation. The apparent paradox was only explained by the fact that the rod-shaped organisms — the bacilli, as they were thenceforth called — reproduced themselves like plants sown from seed, so that it was a matter of indifference how large a quantity should be originally used as a source of infection.

This fact is of cardinal importance in the theory of infectious diseases, and in the practice of disinfection and prevention. Upon it depends the whole system of antiseptic treatment which, since the Scotchman Lister first deduced it from the researches of Pasteur, has wrought a revolution in surgery unparalleled in the history of the world. It is not enough to diminish the number of germs in the air or the media brought in contact with living tissues liable to infection. The germs must be absolutely excluded, for the fewest number, if falling upon a propitious soil, are liable to propagate rapidly, and to determine all the consequences which could follow the most massive invasion.

The epoch-making discovery of Davaine was followed by similar discoveries in relation to many diseases long known to be infectious, but whose agent of infection had been hitherto shrouded in mystery. Singularly enough, however, it is for several of the most familiar diseases that the precise infecting microbe yet remains to be discovered.

The micro-organisms associated with infecting diseases differ from the yeast plant by their mode of reproduction, and hence belong to a different botanical class. The yeast plant buds, and hence is called the Spross pilze, or budding fungus. The bacteria consisting of either round cells (*Micrococci*), or rods (*Bacilli*), multiply by scission, each cell dividing into two new individuals. They are hence called the splitting fungi, or Spalt pilze (*Schizomycetes*). Like ordinary visible fungi, these microscopic organisms are destitute of the chlorophyl which enables green plants to fix the oxygen of the air, and therefore they withdraw the oxygen needed for their nutrition from the molecules composing the vegetable or animal tissues upon which they may have become implanted. In so doing they resemble the yeast plant, and an analogy is immediately established between the process of fermentation set up by the yeast in organic fluids and the processes of disease often initiated by bacteria in organized tissues.

The process is not always a disease. Many bacteria develop chiefly or exclusively upon dead tissues, animal or vegetable, like the fungi on decaying trunks of trees, and, like them, could obtain no foothold on a living organism. The decomposition and reduction



to elementary gases of the organic substances daily consigned to the earth depends upon this action of countless swarms of bacteria—action in this case most beneficent, indeed, indispensable. Indeed, if the soil be too poor in bacteria, as sometimes is the case with the sand of the sea-shore, organic matter is insufficiently decomposed, and the intermediate products of putrefaction remain to pollute the water of the vicinity.

Again, the intestines of all animals swarm with bacteria. These are present in the pancreatic juice, and they aid the digestive ferments in breaking up the ingested food and providing for its assimilation.

Thus some among these now dreaded bacteria are useful, many others are harmless. Flügge enumerates 132 species of bacteria (*Schizomycetes*), of which 44 are round cells (*Micrococci*); the remaining 88 are little rods (*Bacilli*); 16 species of the first group, and 36 of the second group, originate specific diseases in either man or the lower animals; leaving 80 species which are entirely harmless. The last either never gain access to the animal organism, or, being admitted, quickly die without reproducing themselves, or may even multiply within the tissues of the body yet occasion no disaster.

It is when disaster occurs that the analogy with the fermentation set up in saccharine fluids by the yeast plant becomes most striking. The process of fermentation—*i. e.*, the growth of the yeast plant—is attended by the formation of alcohol, carbonic acid, and a little glycerin. The process of growth of the parasitic bacteria is attended by the formation of numerous organic substances (33 have been described), among which one class possesses well-defined poisonous properties, and resembles in many respects such poisonous vegetable alkaloids as conicin, atropin, woorara, or even morphine. These latter substances have been called pomaines. Their discovery is one of the most recent and remarkable in bacteriology, for it tends to establish for the first time a plausible theory of the mode of action of pathogenic bacteria. This action could not be satisfactorily explained by the mere presence of bacteria in the body of a patient ill with a given disease; because it often happened that the bacteria seemed to remain localized in one given tissue, yet, nevertheless, the entire organism was poisoned. This is especially the case with diphtheria. The fact seemed inexplicable so long as the microbes were supposed to affect only those tissues with which they came immediately in contact. It is now explained by the supposition that the injurious action is more indirect. The decomposition of living tissue caused by the growth of the bacteria in it is relatively trifling in amount and importance. It is the poison which is formed incidentally during the bacterial growth which is to be dreaded. This first kills the tissue immediately below that in which the bacteria are growing; then, being absorbed, tends to overwhelm the heart and nervous centers. Fresh supplies of poison are constantly being generated at the foci of infection; and this constitutes the characteristic peculiarity of bacterial diseases, and distinguishes the effects of their organic poison from that of the venom of rattlesnakes, which acts once for all at a given dose, and without possibility of reproduction.

The ease with which the foregoing statement can be

made and read conceals the enormous difficulty of the researches by which these facts have been demonstrated. Three problems presented themselves—how to recognize the different species of bacteria, identify them, and distinguish them from one another; how to prove their causal relation to specific diseases; how to contrive means to antagonize their injurious action. The method which has led or is leading towards the solution of these problems is profoundly simple in its conception and wonderfully fertile in its results. The bacteria are cultivated in suitable media, as ordinary plants are cultivated in suitable soils. The colonies or masses of microbes thus obtained are visible to the naked eye, and much more readily differentiated than are the microscopic cells from which they originate. The culture of any suspected microbe, therefore, is now always used as a means of identification. By following the complete history of the plant from its invisible origin to the death of the visible masses which have been generated under the eye of the observer, it becomes possible to discover what circumstances favor, what antagonize, the growth.

This culture method is due to Pasteur. He sowed micro-organisms in alkaline fluids, whose exact composition he delicately varied until the most favorable conditions were obtained. A minute drop from such a fluid, though representing the trillionth dilution of the original substance, would swarm with bacteria reproduced from the original stock, and inoculated under the skin of animals would produce the same symptoms as had resulted from the original infection.

It was therefore by the results of experimental inoculation that the fluid cultures enabled the observer to identify any species of bacteria. An immense stride was made, however, by the substitution of solid substances upon which to cultivate bacteria. This was Koch's first great achievement. He sowed the bacteria first on boiled potatoes, then on gelatin solidified in cakes or in test tubes. So far has this kind of horticulture now advanced that the exact taste of different species of bacteria may be suited by mixing different substances with the nutritive gelatin, among which some form of beef tea seems to be best adapted to these carnivorous herbaceæ.

The first micro-organisms discovered were rendered visible in fluids merely by being exposed to very high powers of the microscope (1500 diameters). But as the research continued, and bacteria were sought not only in fluids but in tissues, another device was necessary in order to make them distinguishable. It became necessary to color the specimen, and to find, moreover, some method by which the bacteria could be stained a different color from that of the tissue in which it was embedded. The second great achievement of Koch, after the invention of the gelatin cultures, was the discovery of a stain which did actually succeed in drawing out of its hitherto unfathomable obscurity the tubercle bacillus.

This great discovery was made in 1882, and immediately set observers all over the world to work upon experiments of criticism or control.

The German discovery of a specific agent of infection in tubercular disease had been prepared for by researches made in France in 1866, in which Villemin demonstrated that tuberculosis was an infectious disease, identical in general character with the acute con-

tagious diseases, but differing from them principally in the slowness of its march. It was also known that a constitutional predisposition on the part of the living organism was far more necessary to enable the tubercle bacillus to obtain a foothold in it than seemed to be the case for the agents of such diseases as scarlatina, diphtheria, etc.; also, that direct infection from patient to patient was immensely less liable to occur. These facts of clinical observation all find their rational interpretation in the history of the tubercle bacillus, as it has now been unfolded—a secret history more momentous than that found in the memoirs of a thousand Talleyrands, for in such histories literally lie the issues of life and death.

It has been demonstrated by the numerous observers who have followed the guidance of Koch that the tubercle bacillus is present in all the little tumors known as tubercles, which may invade any organ of the body, and are the basis of the lung lesions in consumption. The bacilli are also present in the expectoration of consumptive patients, and the exact nature of a doubtful cough may thus often be diagnosed. The bacilli may be cultivated in masses on gelatin plates, and fragments from these again planted and cultivated, and so on in an indefinite number of successive generations; and inoculations made from minutest fragments of the latest, inoculated into animals, will determine characteristic tubercular disease.

Thus the demonstration is complete that tubercle is caused by the bacillus finding soil favorable to its growth in the tissues of certain peculiarly predisposed persons. The delicacy of the nutritive conditions required for this dangerous invisible organism may be inferred from the fact that the tissues of so many persons will not nourish it, but rather prove deadly to its development.

The ancient problem of Samson seems to have been repeated for the tubercle bacillus. From it alone could be wrenched the discovery of the means by which its strength could be antagonized. It had long been known that certain cheesy masses which had been familiar in the lungs of consumptive patients consisted of lung tissue completely destroyed, and reduced to a structureless pulp. It was now inferred, by comparison with the necrotic tissue found around foci of bacteria in acute diseases, that this tissue was destroyed by the direct agency of the bacillus growing in it. Aided by the new discoveries in regard to the production of ptomaines during the growth of bacteria, it was inferred that the destruction of tissue was due, not to the micro-organism itself, but to the poison formed innocently during its growth, as the alcohol is formed incidentally during the growth of the yeast plant. Now when the tissue died, the bacillus embedded in it soon died also, as the coral insect dies in the mausoleum it has built for itself. The problem given could therefore be stated in this form: To find something which will either directly kill the bacillus, or so destroy the tissue in which it is embedded as to arrest its development.

Until the present moment scientific expectation has chiefly been directed along the first line of thought. It has long been known that the products formed during the growth or respiration of bacteria always suffice, when accumulated in sufficient quantity, to annihilate their existence—precisely as a certain accumulation of

carbonic acid gas in the air suffices to kill the animals exhaling it.

Just before the announcement of the most recent and famous discovery of Koch, Dr. Trudeau, of Saranac Lake, carried out a remarkable series of experiments to test the effect of inoculations with fluids in which tubercle bacilli had been growing, and which therefore might be presumed to be saturated with the products of their growth. These experiments were guided by the great doctrine of vaccination, which was the starting point of Pasteur's researches on hydrophobia. The attempt was made, not to cure tubercular disease in animals already affected, but by the inoculation of an attenuated tubercular virus to render them impervious to subsequent inoculations with tubercle. This is the mysterious method by which immunity against small-pox is secured by vaccination, and by which Pasteur seems to have secured immunity against the development of hydrophobia by inoculation with attenuated specimens of rabic poison. Dr. Trudeau's experiments had all negative results, but they are nevertheless extremely interesting.

It is by slightly varying both the method and its intention that Koch's extraordinary results have been obtained. He has made a glycerin extract of a cultivated mass of tubercle bacilli,—precisely how has not yet been told,—and presumes to have thus obtained in a concentrated form the poisonous substance whose incessant production enables the living bacillus to destroy the tissue around itself. Injection of this substance into the body of a patient, although at a distance from the seat of the disease, thus intensifies and accelerates the destructive, the necrosing, process going on spontaneously under the influence of the disease. The poison is carried to the tissues whose vitality is already undermined, and destroys them so rapidly that they immediately begin to slough away from the surrounding parts and to be absorbed. It is the absorption of this dead tissue into the circulation that is apparently the cause of the fever which is so constantly produced as a result of the lymph injections. By the uprooting of the soil on which they were growing like a destructive mold the bacilli are also uprooted and thrown into the circulation. It is perfectly natural, therefore, that, as has been reported, bacilli should be found in the blood of patients undergoing the treatment. It is not impossible that in some cases they may thus be carried to tissues and organs hitherto uninfected, and re-implant themselves. The immense probability is, however, that the bacilli die in the torrent of oxygenated blood. The researches of Nutall and other German observers, which have been repeated by Dr. Prudden in New York, have shown that the blood of living animals possesses extraordinary germicidal properties, at all events for many forms of bacilli. Tuberculosis is not a form of blood poisoning; the bacilli creep underground as it were, through the lymphatics, the sewers of the animal economy. Hence, as Dr. Quimby has pointed out in an interesting paper, the specific treatment of tuberculosis by the Koch lymph requires to be reinforced by all hitherto known methods for invigorating the patient, and, especially in pulmonary disease, for stimulating the lymphatic circulation of the lungs.

NEW YORK.

Mary Putnam Jacobi.

## "The Builders of the First Monitor" Again.

HAVING no interest or desire except to have the truth fairly told about the first *Monitor*, I should thank Mr. George H. Robinson for his courteous "corrections," in *THE CENTURY* for last November, of certain statements of mine, made in a previous number, if I were able to reconcile the corrections with established dates and facts.

Mr. Robinson says that on "a certain Friday early in September, 1861," Mr. C. S. Bushnell left Hartford for Washington with the plan of the *Monitor*; that it was shown to President Lincoln on "the following Monday"; that it was presented to the Naval Board for the first time "the next day, Tuesday"; and that it was accepted "three days later." According to this the whole transaction at Washington occupied less than a week.

Now the Friday "early in September" could not have been later than the first Friday in the month, which was the 6th. The following Tuesday was the 10th; and "three days later" would, according to Mr. Robinson, fix the 13th as the final date of the acceptance of the plan. But the record shows that on the 16th of September the Naval Board made a report

in which they say that Ericsson's floating battery is "novel" in plan; that they are "apprehensive that her properties for sea are not such as a sea-going vessel should possess"; but as she might be used in still water they recommend that "an experiment be made with one battery of this description with a guarantee and forfeiture in case of failure in any of the properties and points of the vessel as proposed."

It was in pursuance of this report, as I understand the matter, that the preliminary memorandum or agreement for the construction of the *Monitor* was made with Winslow, Griswold, and Bushnell.

It is to be noted that on the 16th of September the Naval Board was in doubt in regard to the seaworthiness of the proposed floating battery. It was to resolve this doubt that Ericsson was induced to go to Washington. He went thither, as his biographer, Colonel Church, says, on the 21st of September. His demonstration of the sea-going qualities of his novel craft was clear and convincing, and the contract for the first *Monitor* was thereupon made with him and his associates. The contract bears date of October 4, 1861.

The difficulty in fitting Mr. Robinson's statement to these dates is apparent.

G. G. Benedict.

## BRIC-À-BRAC.

## "Literary Clog-Dancing."

I WROTE not long ago to an unknown young correspondent, who had a longing for seeing himself in verse, but was not hopelessly infatuated with the idea that he was born a "poet." "When you write in prose," I said, "you say what you *mean*. When you write in verse you say what you *must*." I was thinking more especially of *rhymed* verse. Rhythm alone is a tether, and not a very long one. But rhymes are iron fetters; it is dragging a chain and ball to march under their incumbrance; it is a clog-dance you are figuring in when you execute your metrical *pas seul*. . . . You want to say something about the heavenly bodies, and you have a beautiful line ending with the word stars. . . . You cannot make any use of cars, I will suppose; you have no occasion to talk about scars; "the red planet Mars" has been used already; Dibdin has said enough about the gallant tars; what is there left for you but bars? So you give up your trains of thought, capitulate to necessity, and manage to lug in some kind of allusion, in place or out of place, which will allow you to make use of bars. Can there be imagined a more certain process for breaking up all continuity of thought, for taking out all the vigor, all the virility, which belongs to natural prose as the vehicle of strong, graceful, spontaneous thought, than this miserable subjugation of intellect to the clink of well or ill matched syllables?

Dr. O. W. Holmes, in "The Atlantic."

O GENIAL Doctor, long the friend  
Of poet and of poetling,  
Try, try not thus to make an end  
Of all young birds that sing,  
Or, at the very least, be fair —  
Stop not at cars, scars, tars, and bars  
While bidding headstrong youth beware  
Of rhyming of the stars.

Metinks there is suggestiveness  
In the omitted rhyme of spars;  
I know not much, but I might "guess"  
About the hero Lars.  
For serious rhyming, 't would not do  
To utilize the local "pars,"  
But surely something neat and new  
Might be evolved from Mars.

Wars only famous bards may take  
When they are rhyming of the stars,  
But haply something one might make  
Of fervid heat that chars;  
And, being skillful, one might twist  
A line that finishes with jars —  
For never, even in a mist,  
"Collide" the wandering stars.

And what of each discarded rhyme?  
Were there not ancient days, when cars  
Had nought to do with steam and time,  
And sometimes "hitched" to stars?  
And what of all the heroes who  
To Odin showed their wounds and scars?  
And why may not a chosen few  
Say something more of tars?